DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 163 845 HE 010 604

AUTHOR	Furlong, Thomas, Ed.; And Others
TITLE	State Planning for Lifelong Learning: Improving Access for Adult Citizens.
SPONS AGENCY	Education Commission of the States, Denver, Colo. Inservice Education Program.; Florida State Dept. of Education, Tallahassee.; Florida State Univ., Tallahassee.; Florida State Univ., Tallahassee. State and Regional Higher Education Center.; George Washington Univ., Washington, D.C. Inst. for Educational Leadership.; National Center for Educational Brokering, Syracuse, N.Y.
PUB DATE	Feb 77
NOTE	202p.; Report of a national invitational conference (Orlando, Florida, February 20-22, 1977) ; Parts may not reproduce clearly due to colored background
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$11.37 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Access to Education; *Adult Education; Case Studies; Community Colleges; Conference Reports; Consortia; *Continuous Learning; *Educational Counseling; *Federal Legislation; Federal State Relationship; Government School Relationship; Higher Education; Information Services; Models; Performance Contracts; Postsecondary Education; Regional Planning; *Statewide Planning; Workshops
IDENTIFIERS	*Educational Brokering; *Lifelong Learning; Rochester Consortium

ABSTRACT

On February 20-22, 1977 the Florida Postsecondary Education Commission, with several other agencies, sponsored a conference at which representatives of many states and agencies could share state policy and planning strategies accommodating federal legislation. The report is in four sections, and the contents include: (1) lifelong learning and state planning: Education Amendments, Title I; (2) educational information centers: Education Amendments, Title IV; The Rochester Consortium; and A Workshop Model on Educational Brokering; (3) community colleges and postsecondary planning: Education Amendments, Title X; Regionalism, A Postsecondary Education Strategy Yet Undefined; A Third Version of the Community College, the Contract College; and three case studies; and (4) the state and federal exchange. Appended are the conference program and a list of participants. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED163845

State Planning for Lifelong Learning:

Improving Access for All Citizens

A Report of A National Invitational Conference
Orlando, Florida, February, 1977

THE
GEORGE
WASHINGTON
UNIVERSITY

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Fla. Dept of
Education

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

NATIONAL
CENTER FOR
EDUCATIONAL
BROKERING

HE 010 604

State of Florida
Department of Education
Tallahassee, Florida
Ralp[illegible] Turlington, Commissioner

Education Commission of the States

Florida State University

STATE PLANNING FOR LIFELONG LEARNING: IMPROVING ACCESS FOR ALL CITIZENS

A Report of A National Invitational Conference
Held in Orlando, Florida, February 20-22, 1977

Sponsored by

The Florida Postsecondary Education Commission
Education Commission of the States: Inservice Education Program
The Postsecondary Education Convening Authority of
the Institute for Educational Leadership
The National Center for Educational Brokering
The State and Regional Higher Education Center of the
Florida State University

State of Florida
Department of Education
Tallahassee, Florida
Ralph D. Turlington, Commissioner
An equal opportunity employer

This public document was promulgated at an annual cost of $4,592.10 or $2.29 per copy to provide information about state planning for lifelong learning in reference to the Education Amendments of 1976 for the state's education institutions and leaders, elected officials and interested citizens.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Contents. i

Preface iii

Section I

Lifelong Learning and State Planning. 1

Education Amendments -- Title I. 11

State Planning for Lifelong Learning by Donald McNeil 19

Section II

Education Information Centers 35

Education Amendments -- Title IV 41

The Rochester Consortium by Wilbur Wakefield 45

Workshop Module on Educational Brokering by Francis Macy 67

Section III

Community Colleges and Postsecondary Planning 71

Education Amendments -- Title X. 77

Regionalism: A Postsecondary Education Strategy Yet Undefined by S.V. Martorana. 79

A Third Version of the Community College: The Contract College -- An Analysis for State Planners by Louis W. Bender 105

Case Studies

Case Study #1: The Without Walls Type: Community College of Vermont by Peter Smith. 131

Case Study #2: The Contract College Type: John Wood Community College by Paul Heath. 147

Case Study #3: The Contract College Type: Union County Coordinating Agency for Higher Education by Richard Lucas. 163

Section IV

The State and Federal Exchange 175

Appendix A -- The Conference Program 181

Appendix B -- The Conference Participants. 189

5

PREFACE

The Education Amendments of 1976 of the U.S. Congress encompassed provisions which ultimately may be described as "landmark" legislation affecting every citizen and every state. Among the provisions within the legislation were the concepts of "lifelong learning," provisions for "educational information programs," and further expectation at the federal level of greater planning and coordination emanating from each state in providing postsecondary educational opportunity.

The Florida Postsecondary Education Commission, interested in examining the implications of the 1976 Amendments, felt that a conference representative of many states and agencies would be helpful to share state policy and planning strategies which might accommodate the areas encompassed in federal legislation. The Commission discovered that other agencies shared such an interest and therefore invited four such agencies to co-sponsor the National Conference reported in this publication. The co-sponsoring agencies were the Education Commission of the States Inservice Education Program, the Postsecondary Education Convening Authority, the National Center for Educational Brokering, and the State and Regional Higher Education Center at The Florida State University.

Representatives of the five co-sponsoring agencies met in Washington, D.C. in November of 1976 in an effort to outline specific issues to be covered at the Conference. While the Education Amendments of 1976 was the broad focus of the Conference, three specific issue areas were identified, including (1) state policy planning for lifelong learning, (2) the concept of educational brokering, and (3) the phenomena of non-institutionalized postsecondary education delivery systems. The planning sessions identified a variety of appropriate state-level agencies or offices to which an invitation would be extended including State Postsecondary Commission (1202 Commission) Members and Executive Directors, State Adult Education Directors, State Vocational Education Directors, State Title I Directors, State Legislators and their staff, Gubernatorial Education Officers and Federal Education Officials.

The co-sponsoring agency planners also developed specific objectives around which all conference sessions were developed. Those objectives were: to involve and inform state/lay decision-makers on lifelong learning; to promote interchange among various state agency representatives and broaden their perspectives on policy issues; to inform state participants on policy options and new ideas being discussed in other states; and to inform federal agency representatives about state activities and problems related to Federal Policy. The Conference program which resulted can be found in Appendix A.

The sponsoring organizations were gratified by the attendance during the February 20-22, 1977 Conference convened in Orlando, Florida. One hundred and sixteen representatives from 37 states and territories plus some federal officials, researchers, and leaders of non-traditional education programs, were on hand. (The Conference Roster can be found in Appendix B.) The participants worked in groups of 10, mixed by state and area of responsibility, during the informal discussion sessions over the course of the three days. A "State Resource Fair" ran concurrently throughout the sessions whereby state documents, plans, publications, and other handouts related to the topics of the Conference were exhibited on tables around the larger meeting rooms and either were on exhibit with sign-up lists for those wishing to have copies or were, in the case of some states, available in quantity for all to include as part of their conference materials.

The Conference followed essentially three lines of discussion. First, participants shared information on approaches, experiments, and plans for programs in one way or another identified as relevant to the broader lifelong learning concepts. This was carried out in both formal and informal discussions and through the Resources Fair. Second, state and federal officials interacted during both the formal session and between sessions on implementation of the new Education Amendments of 1976. The third line of discussion related to the future of state planning for lifelong learning as encompassed not only under Title I, Part B, but also through Title IV, Part A, Sub-part 5 and under Title X. (Each of these federal provisions are reprinted for the convenience of the reader and are found in each of the appropriate sections of this document.)

The format of this report essentially follows the sequence of the federal provisions under consideration. Such an approach was necessitated by the fact that written papers were not available from all presenters and in the case of the educational brokering module, an interactive process of involvement between resource people and participants made it all but impossible to develop a report typical of formal proceedings. Four sections, therefore, have been organized. The first focuses upon Title I and is particularly concerned with state-level planning related to lifelong learning. The second section is built around Title IV and focuses upon the educational brokering module of the Conference. The third section focuses upon non-traditional and non-institutionalized postsecondary education delivery systems which relate to Title X and particularly to state planning requirements of section 1202 of the federal law. The final section of the report attempts to present some of the discussion and issues which were raised in the state-federal exchange of views.

The Florida Postsecondary Education Commission wishes to extend its deep appreciation to the four co-sponsoring organizations identified earlier. In addition, thanks are extended to all of the individuals listed in the program (Appendix A) for their direct contribution during the Conference and to those others who participated in the early planning sessions. Furthermore, I would like to acknowledge the excellent work of my staff who spent many hours during the planning and implementation stages of the Conference which, in most cases, were over and above the full work week required for on-going professional activities of the office. Theodore J. Marchese and Charles J. Henson are due thanks for gathering or developing summary materials. Finally, I should like to congratulate the editors for producing this report in spite of many obstacles and the absence of some strategic primary information.

Charles B. Reed, Executive Director
Florida Postsecondary Education Commission

SECTION I

LIFELONG LEARNING AND STATE PLANNING

SECTION I

LIFELONG LEARNING AND STATE PLANNING

When President Ford signed into law the Education Amendments of 1976, the feeling among educators was one of relief. Back in place, with three to six-year authorizations, were virtually all programs initiated by the Higher Education Act of 1965 or added since, including, most importantly, the basic structure of federal financial assistance to students. Welcome, too, were several small but significant provisions dealing with particular recent problems in postsecondary education: research libraries, consumer protection, teachers for the disadvantaged, administration of Title IX, and the like.

But tucked away also in the bill were a series of interrelated provisions with potentially a far-reaching impact on the character of American education. To the original Title I of the 1965 Act there was added a new "Part B--Lifelong Learning," which began with a plainly worded set of Congressional "findings:" that "the American people need lifelong learning;" that it is crucial to their personal well-being, workplace skills, and participation in national life; that it takes place not just in educational institutions, but through avenues ranging from independent study to the efforts of business, industry, and labor; and that "planning is necessary" at all levels of government to achieve the "goal" of lifelong learning opportunities for all citizens.

To realize this goal, Part B authorizes HEW's Assistant Secretary for Education to undertake a comprehensive program of "planning, assessing, and coordinating projects related to lifelong learning." By way of assessment, the Assistant Secretary is told to review all federal legislation for its impact on lifelong learning, including the tax laws, employment measures, student assistance programs, and so on (by one count, 275 federal programs, spread across 22 departments and agencies, bear on the matter). State, local, and non-governmental endeavors are also to be surveyed, so as "to determine whether in each State there is an equitable distribution of lifelong learning services..." Learning needs, barriers, and exemplary programs are to be identified; research and demonstration projects funded; and, in annual reports to Congress, the Assistant Secretary is told to come back with legislative proposals relating to "appropriate roles" for public and private endeavor and "alternative methods of financing and delivering lifelong learning opportunities."

Part B has already drawn a number of labels: "revolutionary," "vague," "sweeping," "a statement of perspective." On its face, it seems less a statement of policy than a mechanism for reorienting endeavor over time; it is not a funding vehicle per se but sets directions for conceptualizing anew the function of other federal categorical programs. Even so, within the 1976 enactment there appear additions of language and at least one entirely new program which bear directly on the goals of Part B. In Title I, for example, Part A is extended to encompass support of postsecondary continuing education programs. Title X expands the concept of "community college" and promises support for programs serving a wider spectrum of community adults. Federal support for state-wide and interstate planning to meet learner needs is again authorized (and has since been proposed for funding by President Carter). Finally, recognizing that lack of information presents barriers to prospective learners, Education Information Centers -- loosely patterned after the brokering-center experiments of recent years -- are authorized by Title IV.

Cutting across the conference's speeches, panels, and interest-group sessions were two emergent concerns. Foremost was worry about the base of support for lifelong learning. As Donald McNeil, head of Calfornia's Postsecondary Education Commission put it, development of lifelong learning opportunities, given dollar ceilings, requires that priorities be set, and priorities will be set politically. Right now, by his report, all segments of education in California are jockeying to be in the act -- elementary, secondary, and postsecondary, public, private, and proprietary, all have eyes on the "adult market." But McNeil isn't certain that all enjoy the broadened conception of lifelong learning described in the new enactment, or that the public appreciates or values the concept sufficiently to fund new ventures.

In a sense, two problems are emergent here. The first is one of definition: what precisely does the national government have in mind by its "goal" of "lifelong learning" for all Americans? Title I, Part B's language is global in character; it authorizes studies and a report (the assistant secretary now has a skeleton force at work), but what is supposed to happen next? As Aims McGuinness of ECS described it, the Education Amendments "have a paralyzing effect on states;" some have extensive commitments to "lifelong" programming, some little or none, but most are now in a state of pause while seeking new clues from Washington.

Problem two is that educator awareness of the Amendments' lifelong learning provisions is low. Neither of education's two most widely read sources of information from Washington -- The Chronicle of Higher Education and Higher Education and National Affairs -- devoted space to Part B of Title I in their coverage of the bill. "We've got to have some guidance on the concept from bureaucrats in Washington," declared a state person, "then get the concept out of the bureaucracy and in front of people who actually run programs in the states." State agencies, in turn, advised Warren Hill of ECS, will have a leadership role to play in educating institutions and the public about lifelong learning. Several participants recommended that broadly based, "Orlando-type meetings" occur in each state.

The second major concern of Orlando conferees was planning. "Planning is necessary," Congress declared on behalf of lifelong learning; but what kind of planning will best achieve the enactment's goals, and how and by whom should it be carried out?

Those who would plan new lifelong opportunities for the public face a number of complicating "givens." A substantial system of formal postsecondary education is already in place. A very considerable level of lifelong-type activity already characterizes that system (adult and continuing education, evening and extension services, and now new "nontraditional" programs, for example). States vary tremendously in their commitments to adult learners. The nature of any longer-term federal commitment remains unclear. Too little is known about public needs or wants for lifelong learning. Legislatures are wary. New tax dollars will be hard to come by.

Beyond "givens," the lifelong concept presents planners, especially at the state level, with a series of knotty issues. Whom should the state support, for example: all adults or only those with financial need? Are all subjects of study -- from medicine to auto repair to macrame -- to be supported? What weight should be given to individual adult choice as against identifiable manpower needs? Should planners restrict themselves only to those programs involving tax dollars? Will existing or new institutions become the focus for new endeavor? How can program quality and consumer protection best be assured? Is duplication of services to be avoided?

Against this backdrop of circumstances and issues, differing approaches to planning were voiced at Orlando. Some proponents of lifelong learning, operating on the national level and regarding the concept as a priority for American life, don't want to see it frittered away by a mediocrity of state plans built on log-rolling and business-as-usual. By implication, they would favor a strong federal direction to the movement, going not only to the content of state plans but the methods by which they are prepared. And there is language in Part B which implies just such an affirmative federal role.

State-level officials, as might be expected, objected strenuously to any such approach. "Keep the guidelines simple, recognize the validity of different approaches, give us the flexibility we need," was the state refrain at Orlando. State people especially resent federal dictate without federal dollars, and little of the latter appears forthcoming for lifelong learning in the immediate future.

Had institutional representatives been present, state officials would no doubt have heard the same litanies directed at them. Tensions between the prescriptive and the permissive, between top-down vs. bottom-up approaches, have always been present in government planning for education, but will be accentuated by issues raised by lifelong learning. One federal official, voicing a skepticism of established institutions felt by some colleagues, remarked that "educators see lifelong learning as a guarantee of lifelong employment." A state planner added that "we can't afford to let a thousand flowers bloom. If we have to crack heads to get the public the service it needs, so be it." From an institutional perspective, though, things can look different. "If we had had a big coordinating board in my state, for sure the Community College of Vermont wouldn't exist," asserted Peter Smith of that institution, adding that "the place works because it's not all glitched up by state rules and planning forms." Norman Kurland, an advocate of nontraditional approaches who has been studying adult learning for

New York, cautioned that "excessive levels of state planning may not be that helpful, even inhibitory."

Whatever the level of prescriptiveness in planning, a more subtle problem may be that of how state postsecondary officers -- often few in number and with limited authority -- can effect the extension of lifelong-learning opportunities to every citizen and corner of a state. The local-program/personal-service model looks right on paper, but bringing into being dozens, maybe hundreds of such programs in a larger state, on a quality-control basis, will be no mean administrative feat.

California's McNeil caught the feeling of many participants in remarks directed against "ideal or final state solutions." Think in terms of "general-level planning," he urged, accomplished within a climate of trust and frank communication. "Prod, help, network, and coordinate," he concluded, that lifelong learning may eventuate as a reality for all citizens.

TITLE I

HIGHER EDUCATION

PART A - COMMUNITY SERVICE AND CONTINUING EDUCATION

PART B - LIFELONG LEARNING

TITLE I—HIGHER EDUCATION

PART A—COMMUNITY SERVICES AND CONTINUING EDUCATION

EXTENSION AND REVISION OF PROGRAM

SEC. 101. (a) Section 101 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (hereafter in this title referred to as "the Act") is amended to read as follows: 20 USC 1001.

"APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

"SEC. 101. (a) For the purpose of (1) assisting the people of the United States in the solution of community problems such as housing, poverty, government, recreation, employment, youth opportunities, transportation, health, and land use by enabling the Commissioner to make grants under this title to strengthen community service programs of colleges and universities, (2) supporting the expansion of continuing education in colleges and universities and (3) supporting resource materials sharing programs, there are authorized to be appropriated $40,000,000 for the fiscal years 1977, 1978, and 1979.

"(b) For the purpose of carrying out a program for the promotion of lifelong learning in accordance with the provisions of part B, there are authorized to be appropriated, $20,000,000 for fiscal year 1977, $30,000,000 for fiscal year 1978, and $40,000,000 for fiscal year 1979.".

(b) Title I of such Act is amended—

(1)(A) by amending the heading of section 102 to read as follows: 20 USC 1002.

"DEFINITION OF COMMUNITY SERVICE PROGRAM AND CONTINUING EDUCATION PROGRAM";

(B) by inserting "(a)" after the section designation of such section 102; and

(C) by inserting at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(b) For purposes of this title the term 'continuing education program' means postsecondary instruction designed to meet the educational needs and interests of adults, including the expansion of available learning opportunities for adults who are not adequately served by current educational offerings in their communities.

"(c) For purposes of this title, the term 'resource materials sharing programs' means planning for the improved use of existing community learning resources by finding ways that combinations of agencies, institutions, and organizations can make better use of existing educational materials, communications technology, local facilities, and such human resources as will expand learning opportunities for adults in the area being served.";

(2) by amending section 103(a) to read as follows: 20 USC 1003

"SEC. 103. (a) From the sums appropriated pursuant to section 101(a) for any fiscal year which are not reserved under section 106(a), the Commissioner shall allot to each State an amount which bears the same ratio to such sums as the population of such State bears to the population of all the States, except that, for any fiscal year beginning on or after October 1, 1976, no State shall be allotted from such sums less than the amount which such State received during the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1975.

(3) by striking out "community service programs" in section 104 and inserting in lieu thereof "community service and continuing education programs, including resource material sharing programs,"; 20 USC 1004.

(4) by striking out so much of section 105(a) as precedes paragraph (1) and inserting in lieu thereof the following: State plan. 20 USC 1005.

"SEC. 105. (a) Any State desiring to receive its allotment of funds under this part for use in community service and continuing education programs, including resource material sharing programs, shall designate or create a State agency or institution which has special qualifications with respect to solving community problems and which is broadly representative of institutions of higher education in the State which are competent to offer community service and continuing education programs, including resource material sharing programs, and shall submit to the Commissioner a State plan. If a State desires to designate for the purpose of this section an existing State agency or institution which does not meet these requirements, it may do so if the agency or institution takes such action as may be necessary to acquire such qualifications and assure participation of such institutions, or if it designates or creates a State advisory council which meets the requirements not met by the designated agency or institution to consult with the designated agency or institution in the preparation of the State plan. A State plan submitted under this part shall—".

(5)(A) by inserting "or combination" after "and institution" in section 105(a)(2); and

(B) by striking out "community service programs" each place it appears in such section and inserting in lieu thereof "community service and continuing education programs, including resource materials sharing programs,";

(6)(A) by inserting "and combinations thereof" immediately after "institution of higher education" each place it appears in section 105(a)(3);

(B) by striking out "community service programs" each place it appears in such section and inserting in lieu thereof "community service and continuing education programs, including resource materials sharing programs,"; and

(C) by striking out "in the light of information regarding current and anticipated community problems in the State" in subparagraph (C) of such section;

(7) by striking out "community service programs" in section 105(a)(4) and inserting in lieu thereof "community service and continuing education programs, including resource materials sharing programs,"; 20 USC 1005.

(8) by inserting "or combinations thereof" after "institutions of higher education" in section 105(a)(5);

(9) by striking section 105(a)(6) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(6) assurances that all institutions of higher education in the State have been given the opportunity to participate in the development of the State plan."; and

(10) by inserting immediately after section 105(b) the following new subsection:

"(c) The Commissioner shall not by standard, rule, regulation, guideline, or any other means, either formal or informal, require a State to make any agreement or submit any data which is not specifically required by this part.".

(c) Section 107(a) of the Act is amended by striking out "$25,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$40,000". 20 USC 1006.

(d) Section 109 of the Act is amended to read as follows: 20 USC 1008.

"JUDICIAL REVIEW

"Sec. 109. If a State's plan is not approved under section 105(b) or a State's eligibility to participate in the program is suspended as a result of the Commissioner's action under section 108(b), the State may within sixty days after notice of the Commissioner's decision institute a civil action in an appropriate United States district court. In such an action, the court shall determine the matter de novo.". 20 USC 1007.

(e) Title I of the Act is further amended by redesignating sections 111, 112, and 113, and any references thereto, as sections 112, 113, and 114, respectively, and inserting immediately after section 110 the following new section: 20 USC 1009–1011.

"TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND ADMINISTRATION

20 USC 1008b. "SEC. 111. (a) The Commissioner is authorized to reserve not to exceed 10 per centum of the amount appropriated for any fiscal year pursuant to section 101(a) in excess of $14,500,000 for the purpose of this section. 20 USC 1001.

"(b) From funds reserved under subsection (a) of this section, the Commissioner shall provide technical assistance to the States and to institutions of higher education. Such technical assistance shall—

"(1) provide a national diffusion network to help assure that effective programs are known among such States and institutions;

"(2) assist with the improvement of planning and evaluation procedures; and

"(3) provide information about the changing enrollment patterns in postsecondary institutions, and provide assistance to such States and institutions in their efforts to understand these changing patterns and to accommodate them.".

"(c) The Commissioner shall provide for coordination between community service and continuing education programs (including resource materials sharing programs) conducted by him with all other appropriate offices and agencies, including such offices and agencies which administer vocational education programs, adult education programs, career education programs, and student and institutional assistance programs.".

Ante, p. 2085. (f)(1) Section 112 of the Act (as redesignated by subsection (e)) is amended—

(A) by striking out "the Commissioner, who shall be Chairman." in subsection (a); and

(B) by striking out "through June 30, 1975" in subsection (f) and inserting in lieu thereof "until the programs authorized by this part are terminated".

Ante, p. 2085. (2) The text of section 113 of the Act (as redesignated by subsection (e)) is amended to read as follows: "Nothing in this section shall modify any authority under the Act of May 8, 1914 (Smith-Lever Act), as amended (7 U.S.C. 341-348).".

(g) Title I of the Act is further amended—

(1) by inserting before the section heading of section 101 the following:

"PART A—COMMUNITY SERVICE AND CONTINUING EDUCATION PROGRAMS";

(2) by striking out "this title" each time it appears in section 102 through section 112 of such title, and inserting in lieu thereof "this part"; and 20 USC 1002-1009.

(3) by adding at the end thereof the following new part:

"PART B—LIFELONG LEARNING

"FINDINGS

20 USC 1015. "SEC. 131. The Congress finds that—

"(1) accelerating social and technological change have had impact on the duration and quality of life;

"(2) the American people need lifelong learning to enable them to adjust to social, technological, political and economic changes;

"(3) lifelong learning has a role in developing the potential of all persons including improvement of their personal well-being, upgrading their workplace skills, and preparing them to participate in the civic, cultural, and political life of the Nation;

"(4) lifelong learning is important in meeting the needs of the growing number of older and retired persons;

"(5) learning takes place through formal and informal instruction, through educational programs conducted by public and private educational and other institutions and organizations, through independent study, and through the efforts of business, industry, and labor;

"(6) planning is necessary at the national, State, and local levels to assure effective use of existing resources in the light of changing characteristics and learning needs of the population;

"(7) more effective use should be made of the resources of the Nation's educational institutions in order to assist the people of the United States in the solution of community problems in areas such as housing, poverty, government, recreation, employment, youth opportunities, transportation, health, and land use; and

"(8) American society should have as a goal the availability of appropriate opportunities for lifelong learning for all its citizens without regard to restrictions of previous education or training, sex, age, handicapping condition, social or ethnic background, or economic circumstance.

"SCOPE OF LIFELONG LEARNING

20 USC 1015a.

"SEC. 132. Lifelong learning includes, but is not limited to, adult basic education, continuing education, independent study, agricultural education, business education and labor education, occupational education and job training programs, parent education, postsecondary education, preretirement and education for older and retired people, remedial education, special educational programs for groups or for individuals with special needs, and also educational activities designed to upgrade occupational and professional skills, to assist business, public agencies, and other organizations in the use or innovation and research results, and to serve family needs and personal development.

"LIFELONG LEARNING ACTIVITIES

20 USC 1015b.
20 USC 1001.

"SEC. 133. (a) The Assistant Secretary shall carry out, from funds appropriated pursuant to section 101(b), a program of planning, assessing, and coordinating projects related to lifelong learning. In carrying out the provisions of this section, the Assistant Secretary shall—

"(1) foster improved coordination of Federal support for lifelong learning programs;

Information clearinghouse.

"(2) act as a clearinghouse for information regarding lifelong learning, including the identification, collection, and dissemination to educators and the public of existing and new information regarding lifelong learning programs which are or may be carried out and supported by any department or agency of the Federal Government;

"(3) review present and proposed methods of financing and administering lifelong learning, to determine—

"(A) the extent to which each promotes lifelong learning,

"(B) program and administrative features of each that contribute to serving lifelong learning,

"(C) the need for additional Federal support for lifelong learning, and

"(D) procedures by which Federal assistance to lifelong learning may be better applied and coordinated to achieve the purposes of this title;

"(4) review the lifelong learning opportunities provided through employers, unions, the media, libraries and museums, secondary schools and postsecondary educational institutions, and other public and private organizations to determine means by which the enhancement of their effectiveness and coordination may be facilitated;

"(5) review existing major foreign lifelong learning programs and related programs in order to determine the applicability of such programs in this country;

"(6) identify existing barriers to lifelong learning and evaluate programs designed to eliminate such barriers; and

"(7) to the extent practicable, seek the advice and assistance of the agencies of the Education Division (including the Office of Education, the National Institute of Education, the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education, and the National Center for Education Statistics), other agencies of the Federal Government, public advisory groups (including the National Advisory Councils on Extension and Continuing Education, Adult Education, Career Education, Community Education, and Vocational Education), Commissions (including the National Commission on Libraries and Information Sciences and the National Commission on Manpower Policy), State agencies, and such other persons or organizations as may be appropriate, in carrying out the Commissioner's responsibilities, and make maximum use of information and studies already available.

The review required by clause (3) of this subsection shall include—

"(i) a comparative assessment of domestic and foreign tax and other incentives to encourage increased commitment of business and labor;

"(ii) a study of alternatives such as lifelong learning entitlement programs or educational vouchers designed to assist adults to undertake education or training in conjunction with, or in periods alternative to employment;

"(iii) review of possible modifications to existing Federal and State student assistance programs necessary to increase their relevance to the lifelong learning needs of all adults;

"(iv) the organization and design of funding for pre- and post-retirement training and education for the elderly; and

"(v) modifications to Federal and State manpower training, public employment, unemployment compensation, and similar funding programs so as to better facilitate lifelong education and training and retraining, for employment.

"(b) After consultation with appropriate State agencies, the Assistant Secretary is authorized—

"(1) to assist in the planning and assessment, to determine whether in each State there is an equitable distribution of lifelong learning services to all segments of the adult population;

"(2) to assist in assessing the appropriate roles for the Federal, State, and local governments, educational institutions and community organizations; and

"(3) to assist in considering alternative methods of financing and delivering lifelong learning opportunities, including—

"(A) identification of State agencies, institutions, and groups that plan and provide programs of lifelong learning,

"(B) determination of the extent to which programs are available geographically,

"(C) a description of demographic characteristics of the population served,

"(D) analysis of reasons for attendance in programs of lifelong learning, and

"(E) analysis of sources of funds for the conduct of lifelong learning programs, and the financial support of persons attending programs of lifelong learning.

"(c) The Assistant Secretary is authorized, with respect to lifelong learning, to assess, evaluate the need for, demonstrate, and develop alternative methods to improve—

"(1) research and development activities;

"(2) training and retraining people to become educators of adults;

"(3) development of curricula and delivery systems appropriate to the needs of any such programs;

"(4) development of techniques and systems for guidance and counseling of adults and for training and retraining of counselors;

"(5) development and dissemination of instructional materials appropriate to adults;

"(6) assessment of the educational needs and goals of older and retired persons and their unique contributions to lifelong learning programs;

"(7) use of employer and union tuition assistance and other educational programs, educational and cultural trust funds and other similar educational benefits resulting from collective bargaining agreements, and other private funds for the support of lifelong learning;

"(8) integration of public and private educational funds which encourage participation in lifelong learning, including support of guidance and counseling of workers in order that they can make best use of funds available to them for lifelong learning opportunities; and

"(9) coordination within communities among educators, employers, labor organizations, and other appropriate individuals and entities to assure that lifelong learning opportunities are designed to meet projected career and occupational needs of the community, after consideration of the availability of guidance and counseling, the availability of information regarding occupational and career opportunities, and the availability of appropriate educational and other resources to meet the career and occupational needs of the community.

Agreements and grants, authorization.

"(d) In carrying out the provisions of this section the Assistant Secretary is authorized to enter into agreements with, and to make grants to, appropriate State agencies, institutions of higher education, and public and private nonprofit organizations.

Reports.

"(e) In carrying out the provisions of this section, the Assistant Secretary shall issue reports summarizing research and analysis conducted pursuant to this section, and shall develop the resources and capability to analyze and make recommendations regarding specific legislative or administrative proposals which may be considered by the President or by the Congress.

"REPORTS

Transmittal to President and Congress.
20 USC 1015c.

"SEC. 134. The Assistant Secretary shall transmit to the President and to the Congress a report on such results from the activities conducted pursuant to this part as may be completed by January 1, 1978, together with such legislative recommendations as he may deem appropriate. The Assistant Secretary shall similarly report annually thereafter.".

"State Planning for Adult Learners"

by

Donald R. McNeil
Director
California Postsecondary Education Commission

At long last, the Congress and the federal government have awakened to the fact that there are other people out there in the vast educational wasteland besides the traditional 18-to-22 year-old students who inundated the colleges and universities during the 1950's and 1960's.

The magic ingredient in the new educational concoction being brewed by the federal government is the adult. The buzz words these days are "continuing education," "adult education," "extension," and the relatively new, popular, and rather grandiloquent term, "lifelong learning."

Typically, the government has fragmented its solutions. The 1976 Education Amendments concentrated on the adult population in an unparalled way. While not yet a tidal wave of support, the waves are higher than they have ever been.

Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965, which had been deleted in every presidential budget in recent years (and restored by the Congress each time) has again become respectable with President Carter's inclusion of the $12.5 million in his budget changes from the Ford budget. Not only does the community service provision start out with a leg up in the process this year by being included in the

President's budget at the outset, there is now added a section on lifelong learning. The new section, Title I, Part B, of the 1976 Amendments, is all encompassing. Lifelong learning embraces adult basic education, continuing education, independent study, agricultural education, business education and labor education, occupational education and job training programs, parent education, postsecondary education, preretirement education and education for older and retired people, remedial education, special educational programs for groups or individuals with special needs...

To help plan for such new audiences, $20 million for fiscal year 1977, $30 million for fiscal year 1978, and $40 million for fiscal year 1979 is authorized in the legislation.

In another Title, the Amendments authorize $20 million in 1977, $30 million in 1978, and $40 million in 1979 to plan for Educational Information Centers for all citizens where they could learn about financial aid, training programs, job placement opportunities, guidance and counseling, and remedial tutorial programs.

Title X authorizes $15 million to be spent in planning for improvement and expansion of community colleges, rapidly becoming adult-oriented in the last few years. Although none of these programs is currently funded, the probability of funding in the next year or so is pretty good.

The Vocational Education Amendments of 1976 also call for participation of various postsecondary institutions and segments in statewide planning to a much greater extent than ever before and thus complicate an already complicated field. The Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education, with modest appropriations since 1973, has given high priority in awarding grants to the development of new programs and services for new student clienteles, including community advisement centers, brokering operations, and new forms of higher education.

All these mix and match with other federal programs which have long reflected the energies and lobbying abilities of education's special interests -- Cooperative Extension, Vocational Education, Comprehensive Employment and Training (CETA) programs, to mention only a few.

In 1975, the National Advisory Commission on Extension and Adult Education listed 23 federal agencies that had identifiable separate continuing education and extension programs. They spent over 8 billion dollars!

Not bad for openers.

State governments, too, have discovered lifelong learning. In almost every state, this new concern is reflected in studies, laws, and enlarged budgets to understand and attend to the needs of that huge segment of the population -- adults -- not now served by postsecondary education institutions.

At the institutional level, steady-state and declining enrollments have turned administrators and faculty completely around from their previous contempt or passive acceptance of extension or continuing education (One wag calls lifelong learning "full employment for faculty.")

Now that the federal government, state government, and institutions have discovered that lifelong learning is respectable, desirable, and financially rewarding, what are we to expect? More billions for lifelong learning?...or reallocation of present resources? Now that we've found all these new students -- (read "adults") and new needs (read "money") how are we to plan for this gigantic enterprise?

In the old days, most institutions had an extension or adult education division. Most programs were on a self-supporting basis; they were usually administered in old houses on the back lots of the campuses. There was no reward system to encourage faculty to participate, and very little access to the institution's administration, and practically no concern or attention by the institution's governing boards.

Now, all that promises to change. But before we start throwing money at the problem, it is time to consider seriously how we plan to handle our new, underserved audiences.

The problem of lifelong learning is complicated by the confusion in definitions. Knock on any door and you will get a different response. Some regard it as off-campus instruction, some as service to part-time students, and still others as nontraditional learning. It can be credit or noncredit, for matriculated or nonmatriculated students, have a degree orientation or a no degreee objective. It may be validation, or examination for credit, or credit for life experiences.

Lifelong learning is often classified on the basis of the delivery system: television, correspondence study, TV and the electronic media, or independent study. It is often defined in terms of target audiences: how to reach the wage earner at different times and in different places, how to get to the geographically remote, the incarcerated, the minorities, and those with low incomes. Slicing across all these definitions are motivations: those adults who want upward mobility, retraining, a second chance at college, career changes, citizenship, problem-solving abilities, or merely to learn for the sake of learning.

No wonder there is confusion.

And what are the plans for all these activities? At a recent conference, I heard an estimate that the feds require about 50 state plans. That's state plans. Fifty state plans for each of the 50 states. The programs established or amended by the 1976 amendments themselves call for seven plans and three of them are new.

Let's take it down to the state level -- I'll use my own state, California, as an example. In 1960, California established its celebrated Master Plan which has guided us through the years. The Plan assigned certain functions to each of our three public segments of higher education. The University of California would draw from the top 12-1/2 percent of the high school graduating class and hold as its private preserve, all education beyong the master's degree and all professional schools, such as law, medicine, veterinary science, etc. The California State University and Colleges would draw from the top 33-1/3 percent of the high school graduating class and teach through the baccalaureate and the master's degree in some subjects. The Community Colleges would admit any high school graduate (and others who could profit from the instruction offered) -- tuition free -- with a guarantee of transfer to the four-year segments if they earned satisfactory grades.

The Master Plan has worked well for the objectives of 1960. But the Plan did not address itself to the question of who would handle the adults and where the money would come from.

Consequently, California's Community Colleges today have a headcount enrollment of 1,400,000 students, the vast majority of whom are adults and not from the traditional 18-22 year old college-going population.

And the Community Colleges have a statewide five-year plan of their own, aimed at new modes of learning, new and flexible time schedules, and new flexible programs -- primarily aimed at a more variable adult population.

The University of California has a plan which includes extension and adult education. So does the California State University and Colleges system. Who else is in the act? Many: the State Department of Education, the unified school districts, independent institutions, proprietary schools, the federally financed Regional Occupation Program (ROPs), the State Department of Finance, various committees of the Legislature, and, lastly, my own organization, the California Postsecondary Education Commission.

We, too, have a five-year statewide plan that leans heavily on the subject of lifelong learning. We are conducting studies of adult education, the part-time student, community college finance, regional planning councils, regional advisement centers, and the related subject of brokering -- a new term (read "counseling").

But that's not all. At the regional level, there is planning (and some implementation) for segments to work together to reach adults through external degrees, with TV (there are eight TV consortiums in the State), and with systemwide access through the "1000-mile-campus" of the California State University and College with its 19 campuses.

And last year, our Legislature mandated planning at the Community district level by setting up regional and vocational education councils to avoid duplication between the unified school districts and the Community Colleges.

This is all probably more than anyone wants to know about California's multiple planning processes. Yet, I hazard a guess that most other states are into it as deep as we are, or soon will be.

So, with everyone into the act of planning for the adult throughout his or her life, we at the state level -- either as coordinating and planning groups, or as 1202 commissions (a federally supported program to encourage all postsecondary education elements in each state to get together for planning) -- have to face the central questions: To what extent do we *want* to plan, evaluate, and coordinate? To what extent *can* we plan, evaluate, and coordinate?

The answers are as variable and complex as the definitions of lifelong learning.

Each state, in finding answers to those questions, will operate on its own assumptions. I have five assumptions of my own and they do, of course, reflect my philosophy, style, experience, and attitude -- and prejudices/biases.

First, I assume there are limited tax resources at every level -- federal, state, and local. When higher education goes out of fashion, it is seldom on any government's priority list of problems or challenges. Education's competition for tax dollars with other tax supported state and local agencies is increasing.

Second, I believe that diversity is good. That is what has made American higher education unique in the world. That diversity extends to institutions, methods of instruction, subject matter, philosophies, and value systems. Conformity and standardization in education would bring a dreadful mediocrity -- the antithesis of change and progress.

Third, planning must be accompanied by some modicum of evaluation and coordination. This assumption is the one most debated by the educational establishment. If you tell me where the person stands in that establishment, I can predict with surprising accuracy where he stands on the planning-coordination issue. Institutions tend to see planning as the integration of their plans. At the other end of the spectrum, agencies generally see state planning as the plans they do themselves and they see state evaluation and coordination as necessary corollaries.

Fourth, I assume that the planning function must be shared, and that, in general, consent of the governed is still a cardinal rule. Not only should participants at all levels -- students, faculty, and administrators, be involved, but so also should those who, by law, are designated planners, and those who finance the ventures.

Fifth, my most fundamental assumption is that we will never have a perfectly meshed plan, given the federal, state, and local levels of bureaucracy; the variations among the states; the differences in structures, philosophies, methods of finance, and above all, personalities. Moreover, there are too many outside forces inhibiting the planning process: the economy may change, different political figures will emerge, and life styles and attitudes change -- often with little or no connection to the ongoing educational process.

With these personal assumptions, let me raise ten questions that state planners will have to answer if we are to try to bring together our resources and our people to provide economical and high quality education for this new adult audience.

First, how shall we weigh individual need? Will student demands be more important than manpower needs? Will prospective students dictate priorities? Will tax dollars go for nonjob-oriented programs? Would a blanket voucher system (free enterprise's answer to demands for mass education) disrupt the planning process?

Second, to what extent will we permit duplication? Some duplication is good -- certain general education offerings and noncredit programs can easily be replicated, and at small cost. High-cost programs are another story. And in our efforts to take education to the people, how often and how close by shall we provide services in storefronts and new installations as an alternative to bringing all students to a central campus. Can we afford endless proliferation?

Third, will we plan only for those areas requiring tax dollars? If each jurisdiction decides what it will support with public moneys, then what of programs which might be recreational in nature or simply for self-enrichment? Wont't these programs, in turn, seek justification for public support? Moreover, who is to pass judgment on a lifelong learner's motivation for participating in, let's say, a photography course. It is self-enrichment (read "to take pretty pictures") or learning to handle a job in a photo shop, or to be an artist? A plan for education of adults must encompass everything within its purview, regardless of the source of funding.

Fourth, how do we set priorities with our finite resources? Shall the individual's perceived needs dictate? Or manpower demands? Or national objectives? Or goals such as equal access and upward mobility? Or ...

Fifth, how do we guarantee quality as we take on this vast new audience? The planners and the evaluators often would like to do the job, but my own feeling is that quality control will be strongest at the local level. No bureaucrat, whether in the statehouse or in Washington, can possibly make wise decisions about the quality of learning.

Sixth, how detailed should a plan be? Do we plan down to the individual program level or leave that to the institution? Do we specify problem areas such as energy, minorities and disadvantaged, professional licensure, or crime, and then arrange our priorities accordingly? The flip side of that proposition is the danger of becoming so global in our thinking, so flexible in our proposals, that our plans encourage everyone to do what they want anyway, thereby negating the planning efforts. This problem is aggravated and compounded as we move from the federal to the regional, to the state, and to the local levels. The more we pursue detailed plans, the more we promote inflexibility, this runs counter to the varying traditions, structures, and needs of different geographical areas.

Seventh, will our planning promote diversity of learning or merely extend traditional modes of instruction? Until now, we have, with a few major exceptions, extended to the adult our traditional methods of instruction and of assessing accomplishments. Credit for life experience, community-based education programs, computer-assisted instruction, cooperative education programs, some television offerings, a few independent study programs, and clinical training outside the classroom are encouraging examples of new concern for the learning process in contrast to traditional instruction.

Eighth, should our plans include the establishment of new institutions or agencies to reach the new adult audiences? Despite the newly discovered interest in adults by institutions, the fact remains that in many colleges and universities, especially at the departmental level, faculty are unresponsive to adult needs. It is understandable. Colleges and universities are traditional in outlook, in structure, and in measures of quality. For the most part, students are taught traditional subject matter in a traditional way, over a traditional time span. The emphasis is on formal classes, lectures, reading and examinations. And so it should be for traditional students seeking traditional objectives. Some colleges and universities have begun to change as the adult students begin to rap on their doors. So the question is, shall we take a chance on existing colleges and universities, hoping they can become multiple-purpose institutions embracing this new audience with the same enthusiasm they serve the traditional student? Or shall we supplement libraries, or create new agencies (the Reg. occupation programs come to mind) or respond to an idea floated by Asemblyman John Vasconcellos of California last year, that we set up a "fourth segment" in the form of Golden State College, an entirely new and independent institution to fill the educational gaps left by the indifference or hostility of the traditionalist?

Ninth, to what extent shall our institutions seek out new audiences as opposed to merely responding to those able to express their needs? Shall they be encouraged in their efforts to seek out in aggressive fashion the underserved minorities, the elderly, women with young children (perhaps on welfare), and persons stymied at a certain job classification? Not enough attention has been given to this. Too often we consider only the education of those who are clamorous enough to receive our attention. My own belief is that we have not yet reached millions who could benefit from further education.

Tenth, who shall pay for what? In California an adult citizen can take a wide variety of courses at no expense. They are paid for entirely with State dollars. But in the University of California and California State University and Colleges, no tax dollars are expended for extension programs. Their operations are expected to be 100 percent self-supporting. I suppose from a taxpayer's standpoint it's no more unfair than the tuition differential between our three public segments -- free at the Community Colleges, $323 at the California State University and Colleges, and $600 at the University of California. However, even in the Community Colleges, the problem is more complicated. When should a program be financed with tax moneys and when should it be paid for by the student? Should a Los Altos banker with a baccalaureate degree pay nothing for a banking course to help him or her in his/her profession? Or should a poor person have to pay a high fee for a photography course simply because it was judged to be for self-enrichment and therefore to be paid for by the beneficiary? Can we ever find a taxonomy whereby rational decisions can be made as to what ought to be supported with tax moneys, and what ought not to be? If a community college offers its playground to a hospital to aid heart patients in recuperation and maintenance, should a jogger who runs to stay in good health be charged? And where do we stop in planning programs and their financing for adults? Shall we plan for crafts for fun, bridge playing, car mechanics, upholstering?

Who shall pay for what?

Eleventh, how do we integrate the federal plans for lifelong learning with those of the state and the institutions? At this Orlando conference we have heard representatives of four major federal programs -- adult education, community service, and continuing education, lifelong learning, and education information centers -- all in one cabinet-level department, publicly confess that they do not relate to each other in any significant way, not in program planning, development of regulations, or in their demands for plans and information from the states.

We can begin there. Each federal program is legislated independently of all the others. And each administration goes its own way. Somehow these forces at the federal level have to start planning and implementing together before they look to the states for support.

At the state level, we hear cries of protest that there are too many state plans, that the federal government ought to ask for a single state plan. I would worry about that degree of centralization. Diversity, one of my five assumptions, is still necessary. What the "feds" ought to do (after they get their own little houses in order) is to make sure the states have worked out the relationships and consultations *within* the states before the states present their several state plans to Washington. The states will do this gladly.

Most of us at the state-planning level do not want to restrain educational opportunity. Nor do we see ourselves as centralizing (read "tyrannical") forces usurping either the role of the institutions, or the proper role of the federal government. As we move to bring adults into the educational mainstream, we need a renewed partnership among the federal government, state governments, and the institutions. Only then will we be able to make any sense out of these multiplying planning processes.

At best, the states can contribute by being helpful, not hurtful, by acting as a catalyst, not a controller, by providing a statewide perspective, and by encouraging creativity. As the demands for adult education, continuing education, and lifelong learning crowd in on us, we need that partnership in planning. And we need it soon, before we spend more billions of dollars on fragmented programs.

SECTION II

EDUCATION INFORMATION CENTERS

Title IV, Section (A)(5) of the Education Amendments of 1976 authorized $20 million the first year rising to $40 million by 1979, for establishment of state networks of Educational Information Centers (EIC). Since the time of the Orlando Conference, President Carter's budget has been issued with no EIC funding proposed for FY 1977. Though this clearly is a setback to the hopes of the EIC proponents, it may be noted that a number of states -- among them Wisconsin, Rhode Island, California, Pennsylvania, and New York -- have used Title I moneys to accomplish planning and initial implementation of EIC networks. Minnesota, on its own money, has completed valuable studies of brokering needs and options. The legislature in that state enacted a law in 1973 to authorize three regional projects designed to improve accessibility to all residents of the state for postsecondary education. The purpose of each consortium is to provide educational information but also to assist in winning the cooperation and support of various public and private colleges and universities which will offer courses and programs which are intended to meet the needs of citizens who because of barriers of geography, employment, or knowledge of available resources.

Wilbur L. Wakefield, Regional Coordinator of the Rochester Regional Postsecondary Education Center described his consortium to the Orlando Conference. The brokering role his office played in bringing the potential student and the potential cooperating institution together goes beyond the concept of Title IV but provides many insights of how one state has proceeded even in the absence of federal funds.

The Orlando Conference examined the implications of Title IV (A) (5) from the perspective of possible implications should federal funding materialize in the future. The program authorization for EIC intends for grants to be made to states for the cost of planning, establishing, and operating Educational Information Centers "to provide educational information, guidance, counseling, and referral services for all individuals, including individuals residing in rural areas." A fundamental concept within that legislation calls for seeking out all persons who might benefit from postsecondary education and making them aware of the opportunities which exist. In addition, information designed to help the individual overcome cultural or financial barriers, physical handicaps, educational deficiencies, or lack of information about available programs are to be rendered so that individuals who formerly would have never considered postsecondary education would, in fact, come to recognize their right for further education as well as the means by which to attain it.

Brokering Centers intended to provide such information, most often funded by a combination of federal and foundation grant money plus user fees, have become a rapidly spreading pheonomenon throughout the states. Their purpose is to link adults with learning opportunities. Services commonly performed include assessment, advisement, information, referral, educational-career planning, client-advocacy to institutions, and information-outreach and talent-search endeavors. Such centers exist in libraries, on campuses, in government offices, and as free-standing organizations. During the Orlando Conference, representatives from a half-dozen such Centers met in small groups with state officials to discuss their approaches, the federal legislation, and the evolving patterns in various states. Francis Macy of the National Center for Educational Brokering organized the sessions and served as the group leader throughout that module of the Conference.

Macy observed that educational brokers, whether individuals or agencies, serve as go-betweens helping adults find their way into and through the postsecondary education experience. On the one side of the broker are millions of Americans who have encountered obstacles to postsecondary education because of social or cultural deprivation, responsibilities of early parenthood, dissillusionment as a result of previous "schooling" experiences, economic barriers or numerous other obstacles. On the other hand, the broker observes the complex array of educational programs sponsored by public or private colleges and universities, proprietary schools, school district-sponsored programs, community college programs, employer or labor union-sponsored programs, community and church-sponsored programs as well as federal, state, and local government agency offerings. From this array, the broker attempts to link these adult learners to the wide diversity of educational resources.

Conferees in Orlando attending the Educational Brokering sessions were divided into small work groups and addressed such questions as: What are the re-entry problems of adult students? How do information and counseling services respond to the adult's problems? How can states plan educational information and counseling services? Where are adult information and counseling services and how are they financed? What are the major problems faced by new organizations such as Educational Brokering agencies?

EDUCATION AMENDMENTS

TITLE IV

EDUCATIONAL INFORMATION PROGRAM

SEC. 125. Part A of title IV of the Act is amended by redesignating subpart 5, and all references thereto, as subpart 6, and by inserting immediately after subpart 4 the following new subpart:

"Subpart 5—Educational Information

"PROGRAM AUTHORIZATION

Federal share.
20 USC 1070d-2.

"SEC. 418A. (a) The Commissioner shall, in accordance with the provisions of this subpart, make grants to States to pay the Federal share of the cost of planning, establishing, and operating Educational Information Centers to provide educational information, guidance, counseling, and referral services for all individuals, including individuals residing in rural areas.

"(b)(1) For the purpose of enabling the Commissioner to carry out this subpart, there are authorized to be appropriated $20,000,000 for fiscal year 1977, $30,000,000 for fiscal year 1978, and $40,000,000 for fiscal year 1979.

Post p. 2097.

"(2) The Commissioner shall allocate funds appropriated in each year under this subpart to each State submitting a plan approved under section 418B an amount which bears the same ratio to such funds as the population of such State bears to the population of all the States, except that for each fiscal year no State which submitted an approved plan shall receive from such funds less than $50,000 for that year. In making allocations under this paragraph, the Commissioner shall use the latest available actual data, including data on previous participation, which is satisfactory to him.

"(c) The Federal share of the cost of planning, establishing, and operating Educational Information Centers for any fiscal year under this subpart shall be 66⅔ per centum, and the non-Federal share may be in cash or in kind.

"Educational Information Center."

"(d) For the purposes of this subpart, the term 'Educational Information Center' means an institution or agency, or combination of institutions or agencies, organized to provide services to a population in a geographical area no greater than that which will afford all persons within the area reasonable access to the services of the Center. Such services shall include—

"(1) information and talent search services designed to seek out and encourage participation in full-time and part-time postsecondary education or training of persons who could benefit from such education or training if it were not for cultural or financial barriers, physical handicap, deficiencies in secondary education, or lack of information about available programs or financial assistance;

"(2) information and referral services to persons within the area served by the Center, including such services with regard to—

"(A) postsecondary education and training programs in the region and procedures and requirements for applying and gaining acceptance to such programs;

"(B) available Federal, State, and other financial assistance, including information on procedures to be followed in applying for such assistance;

"(C) available assistance for job placement or gaining admission to postsecondary education institutions including, but not limited to, such institutions offering professional, occupational, technical, vocational, work-study, cooperative education, or other education programs designed to prepare persons for careers, or for retraining, continuing education, or upgrading of skills;

46

"(D) competency-based learning opportunities, including opportunities for testing of existing competencies for the purpose of certification, awarding of credit, or advance placement in postsecondary education programs;

"(E) guidance and counseling services designed to assist persons from the area served by the Center to identify postsecondary education or training opportunities, including part-time opportunities for individuals who are employed, appropriate to their needs and in relationship to each individual's career plans; and

"(F) remedial or tutorial services designed to prepare persons for postsecondary education opportunities or training programs, including such services provided to persons enrolled in postsecondary education institutions within the area served by the Center.

Services may be provided by a Center either directly or by way of contract or other agreement with agencies and institutions within the area to be served by the Center.

"(e) Nothing in this subpart shall be construed to affect funds allocated to the establishment and operation of Educational Opportunity Centers for the disadvantaged pursuant to section 417(B)(b)(4) of this part.

20 USC 1070d-1.

"ADMINISTRATION OF STATE PROGRAMS

Grants and contracts, authorization. 20 USC 1070d-3.

"SEC. 418B. (a) Each State receiving a grant under this part is authorized in accordance with its State plan submitted pursuant to subsection (b) of this section, to make grants to, and contracts with, institutions of higher education, including institutions with vocational and career education programs, and combinations of such institutions, public and private agencies and organizations, and local education agencies in combination with any institution of higher education, for planning, establishing, and operating Educational Information Centers within the State.

State plan, submittal.

"(b) Any State desiring to receive a grant under this subpart shall submit for the approval of the Commissioner a State plan, which shall include—

"(1) a comprehensive strategy for establishment or expansion of Educational Information Centers, designed to achieve the goal, within a reasonable period of time, of making available within reasonable distance to all residents of the State the services of an Educational Information Center;

"(2) assurances concerning the source and availability of State, local, and private funds to meet the non-Federal share of the cost of the State plan required by section 418A(c); and

Ante, p. 2096.

" 'The Rochester Consortium': A Developmental Program on Improving Post-Secondary Educational Accessibility Through Inter-Institutional Cooperation in the Southern Minnesota Area

by

Wilbur L. Wakefield
Regional Coordinator
Rochester Regional Post-Secondary Education Center
Minnesota Higher Education Coordinating Board

The Rochester consortium is one of three regional projects authorized by the 1973 Minnesota Legislature to be administered by the Minnesota Higher Education Coordinating Board to improve accessibility in the area of post-secondary education. The other projects are based at Wadena, Minnesota and the Iron Range at Virginia, Minnesota. The paper focuses upon the Rochester project.

Rochester -- Higher Education came to this southeastern Minnesota city and its surrounding area in a new and expanded way in late 1973. That's when an important experiment began which uses existing resources in the region to provide better opportunities for residents to earn bachelor's degrees without creating expensive, new buildings or the traditional and stereotyped cloistered tree-lined campus.

The Rochester regional center, a cooperative arrangement involving several public and private post-secondary institutions in the region, was established.

And it couldn't have come at a better time in this metropolitan area where no four-year institution exists to serve the approximately

90,000 people. To be sure, some upper division courses were offered in Rochester before 1973, and to a limited extent some baccalaureate and graduate degrees were available. But too often obtaining a degree required a big investment in time, travel and money that many residents found difficult to make because of job, home, family and community commitments.

This situation existed even though an urgent need to provide a broader curriculum and instructional support services and to increase degree opportunities had been documented for several years.

But following the higher education building boom of the 1960's, hopes for constructing a new institution diminished in a time of economic recession and projected enrollment declines for most of the state.

Recognizing that the educational needs of many area residents were not being met, but questioning the feasibility of another major investment in bricks and motar for higher education, the 1973 Legislature authorized an experimental regional center in southeastern Minnesota. It was a fairly new concept and it began under a cloud of doubt and uncertainty.

"Nobody knew exactly what it was to be, how it would work or if anyone could participate," said Richard C. Hawk, Executive Director of the Minnesota Higher Education Coordinating Commission. "In the past, institutions in the area had not participated in cooperative programs in any substantial way. Moreover, the budget was small for the project. And it was unknown how the community would respond to this kind of approach."

The regional center, often called the consortium, is designed to provide studies leading to bachelor's and master's degrees previously not readily accessible. The project is administered by the Higher Education Coordinating Commission, a state agency responsible for planning and coordinating all post high school education in Minnesota.

The regional center does not offer degrees. But through use of a joint schedule, joint advising services and other means students may select courses and obtain degrees from among institutions that bring their resources to Rochester. Institutions from four public systems of post-secondary education and three private colleges participate.

Now, early in the fourth year of the experiment, community leaders, representatives of area institutions, state educational planners, and participating students generally express enthusiasm about the accomplishments and the potential of this approach. They acknowledge, however, that such a project is not without problems and frustrations. And the future of the center, they say, will continue to depend on commitments by area institutions, financial support and continued positive student response.

To community leaders, the consortium is hardly the four-year institution, such as a University of Minnesota branch, that they would have preferred; but they agree that it has enhanced much-needed higher education opportunities.

Registrations, in fact, have grown from 1,500 for the entire 1973-74 school year to about 2,300 this fall in the credit classes presented. Many additional students participate in non-credit classes and community service offerings.

To representatives of area post-secondary institutions, the regional center has improved cooperation and communication among them and has worked well. It has not provided as many upper division and graduate programs as some had hoped for by now, however. Tight budgets and various resource constraints continue to limit growth and development of new programs, although has been as rapid as sound judgment could allow.

To educational planners, the center has stimulated institutional representatives to talk to each other in ways that hadn't occurred before; and as a result, someone is paying attention to students' needs.

To students, the regional project is a "godsend." It is enabling them to advance toward degrees without having to commute long distances or abandon commitments to their families and jobs.

For Joyce Gibbs of Rochester, the consortium is making it possible to pursue a B.S. degree in elementary education and special learning disabilities without giving up her job or leaving town.

"The consortium saved me," Ms. Gibbs said. "I would have been able to go to Winona State University, but I would not have been able to keep my job, too. Without the consortium it would have been one or the other."

Ms. Gibbs, who works with mentally retarded children at Olmstead Day Activities Center, plans to spend one or more summer sessions at Winona State; but without the regional center she would not have progressed as far as she has. The consortium, she adds, has been responsive by bringing special courses to Rochester which she and others need.

Harvey TePoel had been going to college in Rochester for seven years and received his degree in 1976. Without the arrival of the consortium in Rochester, he would still be going to college.

In 1969, TePoel enrolled in Rochester Community College. He was 23. After taking courses at night and on weekends for four years, he graduated. He was the first person ever to graduate from the community college by going nights, he says. He then enrolled in Winona State's External Studies Program. His individualized program combined traditional courses with independent study and focused on recreation and park services.

TePoel missed only two classes in seven years. Without the consortium he would be 30 or 40 credits short of the degree, he said.

"I worked until 5:00 p.m.," said TePoel, who is an equipment operator and crew chief for the Southeast Rochester Park area. "It would have been impossible to work until then and travel out of town to classes that start at 6:00 or 7:00 p.m. and last until 10:00 p.m., and then drive back," he said.

Although he was a student at Winona State, he took more than 25 credits from the University of Minnesota in Rochester. He was able to do an internship in recreation for Winona State in Rochester.

"My goal is to be a park administrator," TePoel explained.

"But I also have been going to class for self enrichment and a personal desire to learn."

Dorothy Krupp was a single parent head of household with eleven children. She had been a homemaker since starting her family. She had a bachelor's degree in Physical Therapy. After extensive personal advising and educational planning Mrs. Krupp decided to pursue a Master's degree in Counseling. She was a part-time graduate assistant for Winona State University students while she completed her degree and maintained her family. She is now employed as the Director of the Women's Resource Center headquartered at the Rochester YWCA. Her work involves leadership, counseling, support for women with a broad range of problems and concerns. Her contributions to the women of the community are already observable. Her unique combination of personal experience and collegiate study make her specially qualified for the work she so enjoys. She said she probably would not have been able to assume such a role if the program had not been provided in Rochester.

And, on and on...countless hundreds of unique case briefs could be presented...each student has his own story and his won aspirations, needs, opportunities, and problems. The Rochester consortium with its staff and participating institutions largely serves those who didn't go "off to college" or those who have "new" or changed needs. Again, the consortium provides courses and programs for those who have family, job commitments, and who find it difficult to leave the area of commute to classes on central campuses.

Ms. Joyce Meyers serves as part-time advising coordinator to assist students in order that they may be able to progress smoothly in the pursuit of their personal educational goals.

Since the consortium opened the doors to its small office in Rochester Community College, hundreds of residents have walked in seeking information and assistance. The students vary widely in age, educational background, occupation and goals; but a few generalizations can be made, says Ms. Meyers.

"First, most of the students range in age from their early 20's to 40's and 50's," Ms Meyers said. "In other words, they are beyond the traditional age for college and have probably experienced some interruption in their educational careers. Because these are adults, they have multiple commitments -- to jobs, families, and community as well as their own education."

Because of these commitments, most of these students prefer to go to school on a part-time basis, and they require conveniently scheduled classes that are in accessible locations, Ms. Meyers said.

"Most of these people would find it impossible to commute to classes at various campuses in the region," she said. "In other words, they would not be going to school at all if the opportunity were not provided here."

Educational background of students vary from almost no post-high school experience to graduate degrees. Motivations and goals also vary widely.

For some, such as educators and health personnel in the region, the consortium provides an opportunity for continuing education in their profession, and for some others, advanced degrees and better jobs. Other students attend classes hoping to change careers or obtain more interesting jobs by acquiring knowledge in a new field.

"Many of our students are preparing to re-enter the work force after some years by updating their knowledge of their former field or by learning about a new one," Ms. Meyers said. "In this category are many women, who, after 10 or 20 years in their homes lack not only marketable skills but also confidence in their ability to perform academically and on the jobs. The accessibility of the consortium programs seems to be an important factor in motivating these students to take the first steps toward further education."

In addition to students enrolled for purposes of new careers or career advancement, there are many students relatively uninterested in credits and degrees but whose primary motivation is enrichment.

"For these people, the consortium offers the opportunity to enroll in courses of interest from more than one institution with a minimum of red tape and no long-term commitment," Ms. Meyers said. "Some of these students, after their initial exposure, modify their goals and take the plunge into an organized program of study."

According to a sample of students interviewed at the consortium office from August 1974 to September 1975, 224 said they desired a bachelor's degree, 144 said they desired a master's degree, 20 wanted an associate degree, 47 said they enrolled for continuing education, 7 enrolled to obtain post-baccalaureate certificates and 3 enrolled to work on a Ph.D.

Of those responding, 302 were female and 152 male; 364 were from Rochester and 90 from outside the city; 50 had completed high school, 110 had an A.A. degree, 178 a B.A. or B.S. degree, 23 had an M.A. or M.S. degree, 24 had a Diploma Nurse degree, and 28 didn't respond.

Areas of greatest interest listed were business, counseling, nursing, psychology, and elementary and secondary education.

The need to serve these higher education interests, particularly the need to offer baccalaureate degrees in the region, has been expressed for many years.

The Historical Background. "The unique aspect," Hawk said, "is that Rochester is a major population area with a very high level of educational achievement. It is an area with very high expectations about education and historically educational needs have been underserved, especially at the upper division and graduate levels."

Through the years several studies of post-secondary education needs in Rochester have been conducted. In 1962 a study was sponsored by civic-minded business and professional leaders. It was performed by the Illinois School Survey Associates, a group of higher education specialists from Illinois. The study concluded that there was a significant unmet need for additional post-secondary education in Rochester and the surrounding area.

Convinced of the need for baccalaureate degrees, community leaders attempted to bring University of Minnesota offerings to Rochester. This was accomplished through the establishment of a resident director of extension and continuing education by the University in Rochester. The business community raised more than $60,000 to assist in funding the first two years of the operation.

The program began in 1966. During 1967-68 the University provided 34 quarter courses (24 different courses, 6 of which were two or three quarters long) for a course enrollment of 620. Courses were presented by live, two-way, closed circuit television from the Twin Cities, and commuting faculty of Twin Cities departments in the late afternoon, Saturday morning, and evanings. Four courses were presented by Rochester residents who were authorized by the University to teach them.

These community efforts showed the Univesity that there was strong interest and need in the Rochester area and resulted in two internal University studies. These studies agreed with previous ones in finding the need for additional educational opportunities to be real. Several alternatives were suggested.

During this time, also, Mankato State and Winona State were developing the capability to grant baccalaureate and graduate degrees in Rochester in addition to the University. But broader curricular emphasis was needed.

Meanwhile, the Rochester community was busy developing its approach which resulted in a request for the establishment of a

University branch in Rochester. A statewide committee to support a branch was developed. At the request of the Higher Education Coordinating Commission, a study by Dr. Lewis Mayhew, an educational consultant from Stanford University, was conducted in 1970. Mayhew concluded that a new four-year institution in Rochester should be established which would be run by the University.

The 1971 Legislature requested the Higher Education Coordinating Commission to assess the possible need for additional public institutions in the southeastern area of the state, and the implications of this for existing institutions in the area.

Testimony and information presented to the Commission focused on issues relating to a University branch in Rochester. For the most part, presentations from Rochester citizens and University of Minnesota officials indicated a strong desire and important advantages of establishing a University campus in or near Rochester.

But presentations from representatives of some other communities and institutions in the area reflected concern that a University campus in Rochester would be an unnecessary duplication of postsecondary programs and might have a negative effect on existing area institutions.

Following its comprehensive study, the Coordinating Commission recommended that the 1973 Legislature establish a consortium. The purpose of the sonsortium would be to offer or arrange to have offered courses and programs at the upper division and graduate level which could be developed through the cooperation of existing institutions to meet specific needs in the area.

Although the three centers have developed differently in response to the environment in each region, the centers share the same primary objective - to meet regional needs more efficiently and effectively through increased cooperation among area institutions and coordination of programs and planning in the area.

Specifically, the centers seek to improve accessibity at all levels, to identify and eliminate unwarranted duplication in the region, to better use facilities and resources in the area, to provide more effective liaison between regional planning and coordination in post-secondary education with other regional planning activities and to accomplish inter-institutional cooperative efforts in meeting local and regional needs.

Leaders from the community or communities in each region and representatives from each of the participating institutions help in selecting staff for the centers, identifying priorities among regional needs and setting objectives for the year. A coordinator to run each center is selected by the Coordinating Commission's executive director with advice from the local committee.

The decision to try the regional center approach in Minnesota, as opposed to building new institutions, is somewhat typical of developments throughout the country, according to Hawk.

In response to requests for more program options, needs expressed by adult and part-time students as well as the traditional 18-22 year-old students, tighter budgets and competition for limited resources, and expansion of cooperative efforts has occurred. These efforts have been initiated between neighboring states as well as among post-secondary institutions in a region within a state.

A variety of cooperative projects such as pooled service plans, consortia, reciprocal agreements, transfer agreements and regional projects have been developed. Many of these projects, such as the Minnesota centers, reflect the growing interest in life-long learning.

The successful experiments have resulted in increased cost effectiveness, a reduction of duplicated services, greater efficiencies, and the availability to students of additional services and opportunities. Regional efforts have focused on decentralizing decision-making, better coordinating services in each area and encouraging greater involvement in planning by area citizens.

Although inter-institutional projects exist in other parts of the country, no specific model was applied to establishing the Rochester center, Hawk said.

Hawk said he thinks that the Minnesota approach to establish a "institution-community" dialogue through an advisory task force of community and institutional representatives is unique.

"Most other similar arrangements concentrate the oversite responsibility with people from the institutions," he said. "The Minnesota centers bring in the community in a dominant way."

Hawk said that few inter-institutional projects are designed to bring additional services to areas not well served (such as Rochester). Most projects deal with established markets and already-established institutions and attempt to be more effective in combining these, he said.

Although the Rochester regional center is in its fourth year and is drawing increased enrollments, some confusion about the consortium remains.

The consortium is described by community leaders as a catalyst or a broker or educational services. It is not an institution and it does not grant degrees. A student takes courses and earns degrees from institutions that participate. The student makes the choice of what degrees he or she wants and from where he or she wants it.

Geographically the area served consisted of Dodge, Fillmore, Freeborn, Goodhue, Houston, Mower, Olmstead, Rice, Steele, Wabasha, Waseca and Faribault counties. The Rochester metropolitan area is the hub.

Many institutions contribute out of their existing budgets in a variety of ways such as providing courses, degree programs, faculty, classroom and office space and planning assistance. Rochester Community College, for example, provides support in terms of overhead, facilities and maintenance, library and other services.

Institutions currently participating include College of St. Teresa, Mankato State University, Minnesota Bible College, Rochester Area Vocational-Technical Institute, Rochester Community College, St. Mary's College, University of Minnesota and Winona State University.

Headquarters for the center is the small office provided by Rochester Community College. It houses the coordinator, several part-time advisors, a secretary and office supplies.

Classes are taught at several locations in the Rochester area including the Community College, the Vocational-Technical Institute, high schools, school district offices, hospitals, churches, hotels and motels and other sites.

The consortium operates on a modest budget from the state -- about $40,000 per year. Out of this comes the salaries of the coordinator, advising coordinator, and secretary, rent money, telephone bill, duplicating costs and other services. In addition, the consortium has received several small grants from the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for library materials and grants from the Southeastern Minnesota Education Foundation and Industrial Opportunities, Inc., which provides a reserve for the center as well as supplemental funds. A small grant was provided by the State Department of Public Welfare for the Children's Center, a day care facilities for students and faculty which has been operated in conjunction with the consortium. After its establishment the day care center was "spun off" to Rochester Community College for on-going management.

One of the main reasons for making the consortium work has been the participation of the advisory task force, according to Hawk. "The Task Force is an unusually dedicated group, and the members have put a lot of themselves into it," Hawk said.

The 21 task force members, who are appointed by Hawk, meet about once every two months, sometimes more often. Most meetings are held in the Rochester Chamber of Commerce board room. Members listen to reports from the coordinator and institutional representatives and exchange ideas about plans and problems.

"The major accomplishment of the task force has been to represent with some urgency the needs and desires and aspirations of the Rochester community," Hawk said. "It has provided a climate in which expectations for institutional activity can be reasonably expanded.

"The task force has insisted that institutions work together and not engage in unhealthy competitive activities. And it is has been instrumental in creating an environment within the community which is giving this consortium approach a chance to prove itsef."

Fred Hubbard, a Rochester bank president and chairman of the task force, is the driving force in making the group work well, according to several members.

"You would think that it could be a quarrelsome group," said Dr. Robert Aarsvold, superintendent of schools in Chatfield, Minnesota, and a member of the task force. "But the people are educationally concerned for people. I feel this is beautiful that there are not selfish interests."

The main role of the task force, several members say, is to provide the consortium coordinator with ready access to community and institutional representatives so he can get a pulse of thinking and clear up questions and problems.

The Legislative Mandate. The 1973 Minnesota Legislature mandated the Minnesota Higher Education Board to test the feasibility of improving the efficiency and effectiveness of post-secondary education in meeting regional needs through increased inter-institutional cooperation and coordinated planning in three experimental regional projects. A $175,000 bienniel appropriation was made for the experiments.

In response to the legislation, the three regions were selected by MHECB: Rochester (Southeast), Wadena (West Central) and the Iron Range (Northern).

The general objectives of the projects were to: (1) improve accessibility to postsecondary education, (2) utilize existing resources to the maximum extent possible, (3) identify and eliminate any unnecessary and unwarranted duplication in the region, (4) provide for more effective regional planning and coordination in post-secondary education with other regional planning and coordination activities and agencies, and (5) explore means for accomplishing increased inter-institutional cooperative efforts in meeting articulated local and regional needs.

The Evolving Organization Structure. The Rochester consortium was organized in the summer of 1973 with the appointment of a 21-member task force comprised of lay citizens and postsecondary institution members. The technical voting balance rested in favor of the lay citizen with eleven members and ten institutional members. This represented a more symbolic posture toward the development of a program that would be responsive to community needs and aspirations. The task force role is to serve as an advisor to the coordinator of the consortium project. It serves as a forum to discuss community needs, potential problems and concerns of programs and students.

Most executive action on the part of the coordinator of the consortium and the institutional representatives is reflected and influenced by a compelling desire to respond to the community needs in a coordinated and effective way. The chairman of the task force, Mr. Fred Hubbard, frequently speaks for the task force to interpret the goals of the project to other citizen groups, the Minnesota Higher Education Coordinating Board and the Minnesota Legislature regarding the progress of the project. Ultimate executive authority rests with the director of the Higher Education Coordinating Board. Institutional perogatives and authority rest with their executive hierarchy and ultimately with their governing boards.

Seven institutions currently participate in the project. They are: College of St. Teresa, Mankato State University, Minnesota Bible College, Rochester Community College, Rochester Vocational-Technical Institute, St. Mary's College, University of Minnesota and Winona State University.

These institutions provide whatever resources and programs they can toward the total program of the consortium. A group called the institutional representatives meets regularly with the consortium coordinator to approve the joint schedule. The schedule is approved four times a year and is announced publicly through various means. The institutional representatives are concerned about joint planning of courses and programs and about the elimination of unnecessary duplication. Several joint programs have been developed through this procedure.

The consortium does not grant degrees, does not offer credit for classes or employ instructors. Each of the individual institutions perform these functions according to their usual operating procedures. Tuition and fees are variable depending upon institutional policy and level of entrance. Student records are kept in each of the institutions and routinely reported through the institutions. Minimal enrollment and class data is kept in the consortium office regarding the enrollment in classes and the aggregate enrollment in the total program. This information is used in planning future programs and to report the general progress of the effort. The joint advising program is headed by an advisory coordinator employed on a half-time basis, who works with studetns to assist with the determination of courses and programs and educational goals with the student. Much student referral occurs at this point to individual institutions for specific advising and additional assistance for planning a student's program of study.

The institutional representatives have resolved many questions regarding joint programming and transfer of credits among the institutions. Considerable progress has been made in this area and at the present time there is a minimum of transfer problem involved with students who systematically plan their programs of study and work regularly with an advisor.

Classes are housed in available space in the community, particularly Rochester Community College, The Rochester Area Vocational-Technical Institute and public school facilities. As many as twenty-five different facilities have been used to house classes.

Growth in registration has been steady, with more than a fourfold increase in student registration in the first three years of operation. Class offerings have been greatly expanded and many new course options have been faced with substantial budget constraints. A heavy reliance for the support of the program rests with special staff assistance provided by the institutions, and tuition income, as well as several grants which have been provided for support.

A deliberate attempt has been made for the staff coordinator to serve a linkage role and brokering role in working with the individual institutions and the institutions as a group. Much time is spent in improving procedures in resolving various kinds of delivery problems in attempting to respond with as many programs and classes as is possible for the needs of the area students.

Deliberate strategy has been employed to preserve the institutional autonomy and perogatives while at the same time fostering a coopeartive give and take in developing the program. Special attention is given to openness in communication and to understanding the problems and concerns of each of the members. Because of the close proximity and frequent contact among the institutions and staff people, a great deal of understanding of each personality, aspirations, and goals occurs. Territorial fears, while a concern, are greatly minimized by the two-way communication which occurs.

The institutions who participate are both large and small, public and private. The institutions are probably bonded together more than any other factor, with an intense desire to be of service to the students in the area.

The future of the program rests largely out of the sum total of the needs of the students, the commitments of the institutions and their ability to find resources to satisfy those student needs and the on-going support of the policy makers of the state. At this time, it appears that during the next five to ten years there will be substantial needs to be met, courses to be planned, classes to be fitted together, in order to satisfy the area educational needs. It also appears that there is a determined desire on the part of the institutions and their staffs, as well as the policy makers, to continue to work toward the satisfaction of those needs.

"Workshop Module on Educational Brokering"

Led by

Dr. Francis Macy
Director
National Center for Educational Brokering

The approach to the discussion of eductional brokering was handled as part of a group process. Among the educational brokering practitioners involved in this process were: Dr. Norman Kurland, New York State Education Department; Ms. Barbara Bloom, Regional Continuing Education for Women Program at Temple University; Ms. Suzanne Boles, Tulsa City/County Library System; Dr. James Heffernan, Higher Education Department at Syracuse University; Dr. Donn Vickers, National Center for Educational Brokering; Ms. Beatrice Ettinger, Director of Continuing Education for Women at Valencia Community College.

Dr. Fran Macy quoting from the monograph he co-authored with Heffernan and Vickers, titled: Educational Brokering: A New Service for Adult Learners, observed that four client objectives should be accommodated by the educational broker. First is the need to assist the individual to define the personal and working goals for life. In order to do this, the broker must aid the individual in making a personal assessment including value clarification, occupational or career objectives, and appropriate understanding of longterm goals of the client. The Orlando conferees were informed that a broker, in this situation, must have counseling and career evaluating capabilities in order to carry out this important function.

The second client objective identified was that for further education. The broker utilizes assessment techniques and information to facilitate client choice of competencies and/or the needed credentials to be obtained from the educational experience. Information learning experiences may be as appropriate as formal ones in aiding the client to achieve this second objective.

The third client objective identified by the authors and presented at the Conference is the appropriate selection of learning experiences which enable the client to achieve the second objective. This necessitates information on any and all educational and training delivery systems available which will facilitate a selection of specific learning activities by the client. Knowledge of the resources, both formal and informal, within the area must be known and understood by the educational broker.

The fourth client objective identified was that of gaining access to the desired learning opportunity. The educational broker, in this case, facilitates the client's successful understanding and involvement with admissions procedures, financial aid sources, recognition of prior learning, and appropriate placement within the educational organization involved. In order to carry out this function, the broker must be acquainted with procedures and personnel of all of the institutions and agencies involved. These are described as the four brokering activities and can be seen in the operations and functions of all educational brokers which were discussed at the Conference.

Among the key points made during the Educational Brokering Module at the Conference was the importance that a brokering entity seriously examine its purpose and the scope and nature of its mission. Discussion of problems related to attempts to "be all things to all people" found some of the participants describing difficulties which had occurred in their respective states. The image or reputation of the agency is best fostered by being recognized for successful services and thus such an agency needs to state clearly its functions, plans, and purposes. Some participants, on the other hand, argued that such definition can lead to formalization and organizational atrophy. They charged that flexibility and responsiveness are hallmarks which the educational broker should attempt to espouse.

It became clear that adult students often encounter problems of re-entry to postsecondary education because of attitudes or perceptions resulting from earlier unsatisfactory experiences. Discussion of ways for outreach to enable individuals to understand themselves and the opportunities available were discussed. In many cases, the strategic ingredient is the "caring" atmosphere generated by the educational broker. As adults feel a trust toward the individual, greater opportunities for expressing heartfelt concerns or hidden fears result.

Educational brokering is encompassed in the Title IV provisions of Congress. A major barrier to its successful national application will be funding, public understanding, and support from all postsecondary education delivery systems. The states play a strategic role in bringing together those forces or individuals which can discuss the functions of educational brokering and identify the most promising sponsors or agencies to achieve the needed services for that given state.

SECTION III

TITLE X

COMMUNITY COLLEGES AND POSTSECONDARY PLANNING

SECTION III

NON-INSTITUTIONALIZED POSTSECONDARY DELIVERY SYSTEMS

A considerable gap exists between the full-blown concept of lifelong learner foisted in Title I and the real-life funding possibilities under current federal legislation. Not surprisingly, Orlando discussions tended to focus on programming for which there already existed authorization and at least some hope for funding (whether federal or state). Specifically, non-institutionalized postsecondary delivery systems encompassed in regionalism and new community college arrangements were examined.

Dr. S.V. Martorana led discussions of an emergent phenomenon he labels "regionalism." The concept refers to a state-authorized collectivity of postsecondary institutions brought together to achieve a stated service objective within a defined region. The concept goes a step beyond the more familiar phenomena of interinstitutional cooperation and voluntary consortia; it entails publicly authorized and supported arrangements to achieve public goals. The service area may encompass a geographic region of a state, a metropolitan area, or even be inter-state. The service itself my include almost anything from assessment and advisement to direct instruction at any level.

All told, Martorana counts 45 state-recognized regional service arrangements, in 31 states. By his reckoning, regionalism appears a highly attractive "policy and planning strategy" for the newly funded 1202 Commissions (State Postsecondary Education Commissions) and for state program development related to the new Amendments' Title I, IV (A)(5), and X. He and colleagues at Penn State's Center for the Study of Higher Education have a Ford Foundation grant to develop more analytical information on regionalism, and will sponsor a national conference on the topic next year as results of the study are assembled.

Much of the focus in community college discussions -- here, the reference is to the broadening of Title X -- had to do with new organizational arrangements for reaching previously unserved or underserved populations. Professor Louis Bender presented a paper in which the traditional community college -- offering a full range of campus-based instruction -- was contrasted with two new forms emergent in this decade. The first of these he labelled the "without walls" community college, characterized by the absence of a permanent main campus and by programs offered locally (in homes, libraries, church halls) in response to identified learner needs. Examples exist in Texas, Maryland, Washington, and Vermont; Peter Smith of the Community College of Vermont complemented Bender's remarks with descriptions of his institution's problems and accomplishments.

Bender's second model was that of the "contract" community college, examples of which have sprung up in New Jersey, Illinois, and Oregon. In essence, the contract institution has neither permanent campus nor faculty; it is a legal-administrative entity through which desired instructional and other services are provided by existing institutions within a region. The latter may include four and two-year institutions, proprietary schools, and other competent entities such as businesses. Claimed or potential advantages to the student (new learning options, often higher quality and at lower cost), to existing institutions (new sources of student revenue), and to the public (costs per credit hour may be lower, and almost all capital costs are obviated). In establishing a contract community college, reported Bender, there will be issues (to award degrees or not), hurdles (accreditation), and occassional outright barriers (in existing state statutes).

The concluding activity of this Workshop Module was a series of case study presentations presented by a panel of three different state representatives. They were Paul R. Heath, President of John Wood Community College in Illinois, Richard Lucas, Executive Director of Union County Coordinating Agency for Higher Education in New Jersey, and Peter Smith, President of the Community College of Vermont. In addition, Wilbur Wakefield, Coordinator of the Minnesota Regional Postsecondary Education Center at Rochester, presented the paper which was included under Section II of this report.

"TITLE X—ESTABLISHMENT AND EXPANSION OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES".

(2) Such title is amended by striking out

"PART A—ESTABLISHMENT AND EXPANSION OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES

"Subpart 1—Statewide Plans"

and inserting in lieu thereof:

"PART A—STATEWIDE PLANS".

20 USC 1135.

(3) Section 1001(a) of the Act is amended by striking out "subpart" and inserting in lieu thereof "part".

Appropriation authorization.

(4) Section 1001(b)(1) of the Act is amended to read as follows:

"(b)(1) There are authorized to be appropriated $15,700,000 for each of the fiscal years ending prior to October 1, 1979, to carry out the provisions of this section.".

(5) Section 1001 of the Act is further amended by striking the last sentence of subsection (c) and inserting in lieu thereof: "The Commissioner shall not disapprove any plan unless he determines, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing and comment, that it is inconsistent with the requirements set forth in this section.".

(b)(1) Such title is further amended by striking out "Subpart 2" in the heading following section 1001 and inserting in lieu thereof "Part B".

20 USC 1135a.

(2)(A) Section 1011(a) of the Act is amended by striking out "subpart" and inserting in lieu thereof "part".

Appropriation authorization.

(B) Section 1011(b) of the Act is amended to read as follows:

"(b) For the purpose of carrying out this part, there are authorized to be appropriated $150,000,000 for each of the fiscal years ending prior to October 1. 1979.".

20 USC 1135a-1.

(3) Section 1012(b) of the Act is amended by striking out "subpart" and inserting in lieu thereof "part".

Repeal.
20 USC 1135b-1135b-9.

(c) Part B of title X of the Act as in effect prior to the amendments made by subsection (b) of this section is repealed.

Effective date.
20 USC 1135 note.

(d) The amendments made by paragraphs (1), (2), (3) of subsection (a), paragraphs (1), 2(A), (3) of subsection (b), and subsection (c) shall take effect on September 30, 1977.

EXPANSION GRANTS

20 USC 1135a-3.

SEC. 177. Section 1014 of the Act is amended to read as follows:

"EXPANSION GRANTS

"SEC. 1014. (a) The Commissioner is authorized to make grants, consistent with the terms of the appropriate State plan approved under section 1001, to existing community colleges to enable them to carry out the provisions of subsections (b) and (c) of this section. Of the funds appropriated for subpart 2 of this part, the Commissioner shall make grants pursuant to subsection (b), before making grants under any other subsection or section of this subpart, until such time as he determines all approved requests relating to subsection (b) have been funded.

"(b) The Commissioner is authorized to make grants to eligible institutions to assist them in modifying their educational programs and instructional delivery systems to provide educational programs especially suited to those persons whose educational needs have been inadequately served, especially those among the handicapped, older persons, persons who can attend only part-time, and persons who otherwise would be unlikely to continue their education beyond the high school. Such programs may include, but are not limited to, methods designed to eliminate such barriers to student access as inflexible course schedules, location of instructional programs, and inadequate transportation.

"(c) The Commissioner is also authorized to make grants to eligible institutions to assist them in expanding their enrollment capacity or in establishing new educational sites as documented in the State plan. Any grants related to facilities may only be made to institutions which have provided the Commissioner with such assurances as he requires that they have first explored the possibilities of using existing facilities on the campus of the applying institution, existing facilities in the community which are suitable and available for educational programs without unreasonable cost to the institution, and explored the willingness of other institutions within a reasonable commuting distance to provide educational programs, or space or other components of an educational delivery system, through contract or other agreement with the institution.".

REVISION OF DEFINITION OF COMMUNITY COLLEGE

20 USC 1135a-7.

SEC. 178. Paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 1018 of the Act are amended to read as follows:

"(2) admits as regular students persons who are high school graduates or the equivalent, or beyond the age of compulsory school attendance;

"(3) provides a postsecondary education program leading to an associate degree or acceptable for credit toward a bachelor's degree;".

"Regionalism: A Postsecondary Education Strategy Yet Undefined"

by

S.V. Martorana
Professor of Education; College of Education
Research Associate, Center for the Study of Higher Education
The Pennsylvania State University

Planners of this conference are obviously extraordinarily courageous people, for they have combined into one topic -- the main theme of the conference -- two of the most hotly debated topics in postsecondary education today. "Policy and planning strategies" are much in demand for many reasons, some of which will be developed later in this paper, and are being suggested from many quarters with varying degrees of clarity in their definition and job logic and analytical study to support them -- but almost always with much conviction of their advocates. A general expression of interest in and advocacy of "lifelong learning" is also a part of the order of the day in American postsecondary education; the term, however, is a "catch all" phrase found used in the literature of the field to convey a wide range of meanings and usually carrying a connotation that the general adult population of the nation should also be seen as a population of students. Putting the two concepts of policy and planning strategies and lifelong learning together to be the joint subjects of attention at this conference is, therefore, an act of bold inquiry, an act to be both noted and commended for that trait.

The invitation to attend the conference and to present this paper came to me, I understand, because of my involvement in a project which also touches on the two main interests of the day. Over the past three years I have been taking a preliminary look at regionalism in postsecondary education in the United States, and recently a more intensive examination of the development and implementation of the regionalism was initiated. My assignment today, then, as I understand it, is twofold: the first part of my task is to report on the current status and findings of my inquiry into regionalism, and the second is to relate both the concept itself and what we have learned about it so far to the current dynamics of institutional interaction with state and federal interests in postsecondary education. To accomplish these purposes, this paper is cast into two sections, the first dealing with the idea of regionalism and its implementation, and the second discussing the dynamics of interaction of institutional, state, and federal governmental interests to which regionalism appears to be related.

Regionalism and Regionalization

That American postsecondary education is experiencing strong pressures to be pushed beyond the campuses of individual colleges and universities is a well documented observation. Limitations of time and space prohibit a full review of that literature here. The pressures were noted in several places by the Carnegie Commission[1] and are the subject of many shorter treatises. One of the best in my judgment is entitled, "The Interdependence of Higher Education," by Joseph A. Cronin, in which he suggests, "Higher education institutions may need to prepare a declaration of interdependence as part of the survival strategy for the 1980s," as the answer to two pressing questions he raises, "What happened to the exalted precious, and separate state of higher education? Why must totally isolated colleges and universities work together?"[2]

The Baseline Study

Regionlism may be a declaration of postsecondary interdependence made for it as well as by it. This can be said because both external state agencies with official authority to act in postsecondary education and individual institutions are involved in it. For purposes of the baseline study which covered the years 1973-1975,[3] regionalism was defined as that view of a geographic sub-section of a state (or of several adjoining states) which considers all (or a number) of the postsecondary educational components collectively and seeks to establish a coordinated relationship of their goals, programs, and/or resources. That is the idea, regionalism as a concept; regionalization is then simply the acts or processes by which the concept is put into practice; the implementation of regionalism is regionalization. It is manifested, obviously, in some form of interinstitutional, cooperative arrangement.

For purposes of our study, however, we attached another criterion for inclusion of interinstitutional arrangements into the counts of practice we wanted to describe; it was that the regional arrangement be one that, in some way or another, was officially recognized by an authoritative agency in the state. This could be, naturally, the Governor or Legislature by executive action or statute, or a state-level coordinating or governing board responsible for postsecondary education in whole or in part in the state.

This matter of official recognition is important, for it is a way to separate the concept of regionalism as an aspect of statewide planning and coordination of postsecondary education from the more general phenomenon of consortia which are more typically ad hoc, voluntary, interinstitutional arrangements. These merit attention because (1) they are in some sense forerunners of regionalism, (2) because they are in some cases coming into the proeess of recognized, official regionalism, and (3) because they provide already some basis of experience from which officials considering regionalism can profit. Identification and preliminary examination of these consortia dates back now nearly 20 years,[4] but in recent years, the person most directly following this development is Lewis D. Patterson, headquartered until recently in the AAHE. For several years he has produced an annual count of formally organized consortiums. The 1975 count is 106. But, as he says, this is only a small glimpse of the interinstitutional connections emerging throughout the land:

> "Numbers at best only tell a part of the cooperative movement. In the past two years new areas are receiving increased attention such as among community colleges, in continuing education, in medical and health programs, in military programs, in theology and in the arts. Two trends to observe in the future will be: the movement to state regionalization where it becomes increasingly difficult to distinguish between voluntary and statuatory systems; and a broadening of the base of participation to include the full range of the postsecondary community and related community/regional agencies in cooperative arrangements."[5]

In passing, one should note for the record that the achievements of consortia to date are not very impressive. Franklin Patterson (no relation to Lew, I'm told) paints a dim view of their attainments as contrasted to their aspirations in a book-length treatment entitled *Colleges in Consort: Institutional Cooperation Through Consortia*.[6]

But McGuire and I discovered much stronger interest and action in regionalism and regionalization than we expected to discover. Here only a few highlights from the study can be reported, for time and space are limited.

Level of Interest and Activity -- Some 60% (31 of 50) of the states are actively engaged in regionalism as an aspect of planning and coordinating postsecondary educational resources. Most of this activity is concentrated in the Middle Atlantic, Southeastern, and Midwestern regions of the nation. Some correlation seems evident that larger states and those with more complex enterprises in postsecondary education, are more actively concerned with regionalism than those that encompass smaller geographic areas or have less diversity in postsecondary educational services within their boundaries. In several states, more than one officially recognized approach to regionalism is operative. In some, this is because of separate actions by different agencies, each operating within its own spheres of authority; and in others, the same agency is applying regionalism in different ways to different elements of the postsecondary educational enterprise for which they are responsible.

Altogether the 45 regionalization patterns in 31 different states, with the number under study nearly one-half of the total in effect, support a clear conclusion that activity as well as interest in regionalism and regionalization will remain high for some time. This conclusion, furthermore, is reinforced by the statements advanced by the state officials surveyed to the effect that the pressures now operative to stimulate regionalism in their states will be at hand at least for the foreseeable future.

Influencing Factors -- Beyond the generally observed forces in society and economy of the nation which create pressures on postsecondary education for a higher level of accountability to its constituencies, several factors seem to encourage regionalism when they exist in a state. A primary one is the leadership posture assumed and role played by state-level boards or commissions with official responsibility for the general surveillance of a state's postsecondary educational enterprise or for a major segment of that enterprise. Such agency leadership far outranked any other influencing factor in the reports provided by the states for this study: 36 plans in 24 states were so described.

Although falling far behind the frequency reported for state agencies, the role of legislative actions merits attention, for in 12 states, and 13 regionalization plans (9 in effect and 4 under study) this involvement was reported. The developmental experience of other earlier organizational shifts in American postsecondary education, for example, the community colleges demonstrate that permissive or enabling legislation abets the organizational change and considerably accelerates action concerning it. Whether or not this will be a distinguishable feature with respect to regionalization, of course, remains to be seen.

Finally, of note is the influential role of special studies of postsecondary education as presently operating in the state. Whether done as internal projects by staffs of state agencies or special commissions, or by outside specialists or consultants for either standing or ad hoc auspices within the state, the accomplishment of special studies are also often mentioned as factors contributing to regionalism and consequent action to implement the concept.

Patterns of Regionalization -- As yet no generalizable pattern appears evident among the approaches reported to regionalism by the several states. Among the five patterns identified from the descriptions of the 45 regionalization plans available, the three encompassing most plans were: borad regional needs -- a pattern which seeks to meet broad postsecondary educational needs within each of several geographic regions established throughout the state (12 plans); specific areas needs -- a pattern to meet the postsecondary educational needs of a special, particular geographic sub-section of a state (15 plans); and specific program or section needs -- a pattern dealing with a single academic program or a single sub-section of postsecondary education (15 plans). Interstate arrangements -- a pattern involving either the entire state or a sub-section of a state with either the entire state or sub-sections of other states applied to 10 plans. The remaining pattern (institutional diversification -- a pattern of official encouragement of voluntary institutional actions to complement and supplement each other in a given area or program to develop a greater level of diversification in postsecondary education) was found applicable only to three plans.

At this moment in the development of postsecondary education, there is no evident justification for support of any one or even a few of the several patterns identified. It may well be the case that each can be supported as an approach to regionalism having in each case its own merit. Put another way, there may be different purposes held for regionalism in a given state which to accomplish will require different rather than a common pattern of regionalization. This possibility is another of the continuing lines of inquiry to which further efforts needs to be applied.

Objectives of Regionalism -- This study established clearly that there are indeed different purposes held for regionalism in a particular state and for different regionalization plans. Most states reporting on their purposes (23 out of 24) stated that a better utilization of resources was the objective pursued and this goal was set for 34 plans examined. This was the predominant purpose and reflects the pressures for more efficiency and productivity put upon state-level planning and coordinating agencies at this time.

No other purpose was even close to the goal of more effective resource utilization. The goal of increasing postsecondary educational opportunity and services in a region ran a poor second, 12 states and 17 plans. None of the other purposes identified (improving interinstitutional communications, helping form a base for long range planning, and strengthening systems as organizations) were found to include as many as 10 states or plans.

Sources of Authority -- Regionalism is implemented predominantly by three types of authority: administrative authority possessed by the executive branch or an agency of state government, legislative authority expressed in statutes, and authority held by established postsecondary educational institutions. Among these three, far and away the most common authoritative source giving life to regionalism is that held by administrative units in state government, sometimes the governor, as chief executive, but more often a state board of regents or statewide educational planning agency. This last was the case in nineteen states and twenty-two plans.

To be noted, however, because of the known effect that legislative authorization has upon developments statewide and across state lines when a significant number of legislatures act in a common direction, is the sizeable number of states and plans touched directly by the statutes. This was reported to be the case in nine states relating to ten plans, eight in effect and two under study. Some further importance may be evident in that all of these were in the New England, Mid-Atlantic, and North Central States; none was found in states grouped into the Western or Southeastern regions of the nation.

Contrary to the expectation first held in this study, relatively few officially recognized regional plans derive from simple authority of the postsecondary institutions involved. This was found present in four states relating to four plans. This finding is not interpreted, however, as suggesting that few voluntary interinstitutional arrangements to meet regional needs are to be found, for the facts show us this is clearly not true -- there are many. What it does seem to indicate, however, is that many of these have not yet been given an officially recognized status by a state-level agency with statewide authority -- one essential element in the definition set to identify regionalism plans in this study. If regionalism and regionalization continue to attract increasing attention by statewide planning and coordinating agencies, such recognition of arrangements already set in motion by institutional action may show an increase.

Governance and Administration -- As yet the structural arrangements attached to regionalism plans are amorphous; this seems to be the only tenable generalization coming from the information provided in response to the relatively unstructured call for descriptive information used in the study; while the reports both dwelt often at length on other matters of interest, the matter of structure reflected much lower awareness or special interest. When the fifteen states and twenty-four plans for which information did come forth were examined, no more than a half-dozen or so (both of states and plans) reflected common practices in governance and administrative structure: this was true with respect to use of advisory boards, involvement of institutional governing boards, use of institutional member representation, and use of state agency representation.

The immature organizational status of the regionalization approaches in organizational terms is also evident in the fact that single, executive leadership is rarely present. Only three plans in as many states were reported to have an executive director.

Here again a caveat against possible misinterpretation should be advanced: it could be quite erroneous to conclude that since the present evidence of structure for governance and administration is weak, movement toward such organizational development will not occur. Again, the history of institutional developments tells a contrary conclusion. The matter needs more examination and more watching. It may well be, furthermore, that even incipient, early expressions of interest in developing more organizational identify to regionalization plans are suppressed to forestall their being viewed as threats to existing institutions or other established patterns for administering postsecondary education in a region. When a positive, cooperative, and nonthreatening perception of regionalism can be established and maintained, chances of implementing plans to succeed are much greater than when the opposite situation exists.

Funding Patterns -- As in the case of governance and administrative structures, this preliminary study did not get into the question of financing patterns for regionalization as an in-depth examination. Some useful data on nine regionalization plans in six states did come forward. These indicated that state and institutional funds were most heavily utilized; federal funds served to help two plans in two states and the same was true for use of private funds. Only two plans, one in New York and one in Illinois, drew on three different sources of funds; both used state and institutional funds, but while one of the two used federal funds as the third source, the other relied on private resources.

Some Tentative Conclusions -- Current literature in higher education abounds with news about the process of change in which the nation's postsecondary educational institutions are involved. A scholarly commission calls for concern for "More than Survival," (The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1975)[7]; the executive head of a major national higher education association stumps the country, calling for a new national movement toward, "community-based, performance-oriented, postsecondary education," (Gleazer, 1974)[8]; the federal government passes legislation calling for state commissions for "state postsecondary education commissions" to carry on "comprehensive statewide planning" of "all public and private postsecondary educational resources in the state, including planning necessary for such resources to be better coordinated, improved, expanded, or altered so that all persons within the state who desire, and who can benefit from, postsecondary education may have the opportunity to do so." (Higher Education Amendments of 1972).[9]

All of these developments, and many others in evidence today, suggest that new forms for provision of postsecondary education are in the making. Regionalization plans in, between, and among the several states of the nation, may be one of these and that is why this study is to be a continuing one. A gradutate student in higher education at The Pennsylvania State University perhaps posed the critical question, the answer to which may well determine the future course of regionalism and regionalization in postsecondary education as an approach to state-level planning to merit regional needs. In the course of a study examining the relative roles of state-level coordinating boards and local, institutional boards of community colleges, he asked, "Does the matter of regional needs represent a 'no man's land' in definition of local versus state authority?" (Sturtz).[10] The question was prompted by his recurrent observation of a split in views held by local as opposed to state officials in postsecondary education as to who should assess regional needs for postsecondary education and should plan for, and set policy to guide an effective educational response to those needs. Regionalism may be the first manifestation of awareness that the "no man's land" exists; and regionalization may be the way to now unclaimed domain of service will be entered without there having to be battle among the several existing postsecondary educational interests who have a claim to the right to serve it.

The Current Inquiry

As is usually the case with a preliminary investigation, the baseline study raised more questions than it provided answers. With both the study and the appetite it whetted for a more penetrating analysis in hand, we approached the Ford Foundation for help to make a truly definitive study of regionalism in postsecondary education. That study is now launched and will be continuing for the next 12-18 months. Besides updating the survey of regionalism in the United States and making the survey in a way to get much more detail about both the scope and depth of regionalization plans, the current project includes case studies of six or eight states. Under consideration are six states found in the baseline study to be well advanced in their consideration or implementation of regionalization plans; California, Illinois, Minnesota, New York, Ohio, and Pennsylvania. Two others, yet to be chosen, are to be added to improve the geographic spread of the case study states; one from the Rocky Mountain and another from the South.

The current study is designed so that it will establish for each state an accurate picture of the extent, if any, to which regionalism of postsecondary educational resources is used in reaching policy decisions in the various aspects of operation such as program coordination and resource allocation. As a second major line of research, it will establish for each regionalization plan identified in its efforts, a detailed description of the purposes, scope, institutional inclusion, and *modus operandi* of the plan.

Finally, participants in this conference will likely be interested in knowing that the culminating activities of the Ford funded project will either be a national invitational conference or a series of regional ones in the nation to discuss the study's outcomes. Besides this, the usual other discrimination measurers, that is a series of progress reports and a final, summary publication are planned.

Institutional, State, and Federal Interaction

The title of this paper suggests that regionalism in postsecondary education may be viewed as a strategy as yet not fully defined by which collegiate interests can better accommodate adjustments which current and emerging conditions seem to demand. What are these conditions and how might regionalism and regionalization be related to them? The answer to this is evident in the increasing interaction of postsecondary institutions, with state governments and the federal government. Full development of this interaction is beyond the scope of this paper, (indeed much of this entire conference centers on that topic), but a brief discussion of the interaction as it relates to regionalism is possible.

A general observation should be made at the outset; it is that current and evidently emerging conditions are coalescing to move the focus of postsecondary education out from individual collegiate campuses. Under the new conditions that are taking shape institutional interests as well as those of government at both state and federal levels seem to be forcing a common outcome -- a design for accomplishing the tasks of postsecondary education by a multi-faceted structure rather than one comprised of a single component, or only a few.

Institutional Interests

The catalog of pressures on collegiate institutions to accommodate to new conditions is now so much of the literature that one hesitates to review it again, especially for an audience as well informed on the matter as it assembled here. Out of it all comes notice of at least five that demand institutional action: (1) the leveling off of enrollments of so-called regular college students, that is those recently graduated from high school and attending college on a full-time basis; (2) the simultaneous new recognition of the older adult student, engaged in postsecondary education only part-time; (3) the increasing difficulty colliegate institutions are encountering in getting the fiscal support they need from their supporting clienteles including the taxpaying public; (4) the trend among all types of colleges, both private and public, to seek public funding, either directly or indirectly; and (5) the increasing accountability requirements imposed on postsecondary educational institutions by a wide range of constituencies claiming a legitimate right to have an accounting provided by the academy.

Faced with the need to respond to all of these pressures, and others, many institutions are concluding that they cannot "go it alone." As a consequence, they exhibit both a more frequent initiative in seeking a collaborative relationship with other postsecondary educational interests and a more positive response when the suggestion of such collaborative arrangements come from others. This conclusion seems well supported by the growing list' of voluntary consortiums identified by Lew Patterson as well as isolated special studies like the CUPIR project of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges and the PSU/CSHE.[11]

Notice the special difficulty that colleges encounter when they try individually to resolve the complex of forces they face. For example, faced with leveling off of enrollments, they may claim a right to make unilateral policy decisions about student recruitment and programs to be offered to attract or hold students, but simultaneously they may seek public funding. When several different segments of postsecondary education in a state follow that course of action, one of two results seems to be inevitable: right to unilateral action is preserved but fiscal support is still withheld, or, some autonomy is foresaken and a structure that reflects a more responsible accountability to the supporting public is established. It seems unreasonable to assume that collegiate institutions can have both a common source of funding and the right to operate as if in a "free market" model.

State Governmental Interests

The fact that all types of postsecondary educational institutions are increasingly claiming eligibility for public funding, either directly by appropriations to support institutions or indirectly by benefiting from augmented student financial aid programs, is only one of a number of developments that are forcing state governmental interests to view colleges in a collective view as opposed to one which sees them as individual operations. Agencies responsible at the state level must necessarily take a statewide perspective in examining both the state's interests and needs on the one hand, and the total complex of resources that can be called upon to satisfy them on the other; the view called "the global look" in the words of my former collegue in the New York State Education Department, Commissioner of Education Ewald B. Nyquist (now Former Commissioner).

Consider for a moment what are the typical, compelling concerns of a state agency acting responsibly as such. They would include such broad goals as (1) assuring widespread and impartial access to postsecondary education for all of the citizenry who want and can profit by it; (2) assuring that the education provided is of a reasonable minimal level of quality so that both the student and the general society, as consumers of the educational service provided, are not victimized; (3) assuring that both of these first two goals are achieved at the highest possible level of cost effectiveness, that is, maximum achievement with minimum outlay of costly and scarce personal or material resources; (4) assuring sufficient diversity in programs, locations of programs, types of institutions, and modes of instruction to provide reasonable coverage of the interests of students (a consideration which relates to access) but which also protects against development of a monopoly by single institutions or types of institutions (a consideration which relates to the presentation of quality); and (5) assuring a flexibility in the total enterprise so that unpredicted conditions, if such arise, will not immobilize all activity. (The 1977 winter is teaching us how important this can be.)

Somewhat as an aside here, we should note that it matters little what the state agency is that sets the policies for postsecondary education, the large considerations just stated are compelling. Educators are concerned, (I believe rightly so) about the trend toward loss of control of educational policy formulation to state legislators and governors; to the federal congress and executive agencies; and to the courts.[12] The point here, however, is that a responsible state-level agency, be it a legislature or a board of regents, cannot escape pressures to meet the interests and needs of the state viewed in a comprehensive fashion.

The reason for cataloguing such commonly known broad goals of an agency when a statewide "global" perspective of postsecondary education is taken is to bring out and emphasize a single point: all of these large state interests suggest a need to rely on a complex of institutions not on any one or, even a, single type. In the jargon of the day "delivery systems" appear to be needed; both a logical analysis of the complex of goals stated above and a close look at the operations of the usual array of colleges found in most states support that conclusion.

If the conclusion and related generalization hold up against critical, logistical appraisal and further empirical observation, the suggestion of regionalism as a constructive, workable approach seems more plausible. Planning and programming on an individual campus basis is too atomistic on an approach; use of the total state may do injustice to some of its parts; regionalism fits best. This is evidently the case at least in such states as California and Florida, among others, where very recent developments, reported to us since the baseline study was published, show sharply heightened interest and activity in regionalism.

Federal Governmental Interests

We now turn to the highest governmental interest in the land, the expression of national policies by the federal government. By the very nature of the program planned for this conference, a great deal of attention must focus on actions taken recently by the federal government. In the context of its need to cover the subject of regionalism, however, this paper needs necessarily to repeat some of that review of federal legislation as well as to note other types of federal activity that bears on the subject.

There can be little doubt that the Higher Education Act of 1965, the 1972, and the 1976 amendments gave considerable impetus to interinstitutional cooperative action. The effect of Title III of the first act, for example, was to encourage consortia of institutions of many types. The AACJC seized upon its provision to launch a nationwide program to assist developing institutions, grouped in a variety of interstate and intrastate regional combinations. The 1972 amendments brought forth the now famous (at least in postsecondary education planning circles) "1202" statewide, comprehensive planning commissions. All but three states have now established such commissions, and many of them have adopted the concept of regionalism as they set about comprehensive, postsecondary educational planning in their states.

But perhaps the most striking way to show the growing influence of the federal law on interest in regionalism is by noting the several places where notions related to it appear in the latest amendments passed just last summer. From the Higher Education Amendments of 1976 language is used which suggests regionalism in several places. On example is, "supporting resource material sharing programs" (Title I, Part A, Community Services and Continuing Education). The Act goes on to define that phrase as "planning for the improved use of existing community learning resources by finding ways that combinations of agencies, institutions, and organizations can make better use of existing educational materials, communication technology, local facilities, and such human resources as will expand learning opportunities for adults in the area being served." A state plan developed by an agency which is "broadly representative of institutions of higher education in the State" is necessary to qualify for the federal funds provided.

In another part of the same title, a program is launched to support "Lifelong Learning." After defining this to mean just about any learning or training activity that an adult may wish to pursue, the Act calls upon the Assistant Secretary for Education in the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to, "review the lifelong learning opportunities provided through employers, unions, the media, libraries and museums, secondary schools and postsecondary educational institutions, and other public and private organizations to determine means by which the enhancement of their effectiveness and coordination may be facilitated.

In Title IV which has to do with student assistance, a provision is made for assisting states to establish or expand "service learning centers" through "grants or contracts." And in another part of Title IV encourages states to make grants or enter into contracts, "with institutions of higher education, combinations thereof and other agencies or organizations to set up 'Educational Information Centers'."

In Title X, "Establishment and Expansion of Community Colleges," several significant and relevant changes are notable. One is the use of the term "delivery systems" to better serve handicapped, part-time, and students unlikely to continue their education otherwise. Another is the extension of the authority of the "1202 Commissions" in developing statewide plans for community college education "to plan, develop, and carry out interstate cooperative postsecondary education projects."

These illustrations should suffice, but to clench the point that the federal influence is clearly being felt in state-level interest in regionalism, brief mention needs to be made of other laws that push the same ideas. Regionalism can be easily and clearly connected in the language used to describe intent, to suggest structure, and to encourage procedures to implement the Comprehensive Education and Training Act. This is also true in the sections related to state plan development found in the 1976 amendments to the Vocational Education Acts. Indeed, at the recent meeting of the National Advisory Council named to assist us in the extended study of regionalism, the persons most closely involved in state governmental operations called attention to the fact that, beyond the laws, the operating policies of such federal departments or agencies such as the Department of Defense, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of Agriculture, as well as Health, Education, and Welfare and the U.S. Office of Education often operated to regionalize postsecondary educational resources both across and within state boundaries.

Here a reference is appropriate to a need to distinguish between the thrusts of different inquiries into the influence of the federal governmental policies (either the statutes or regulations promulgated by operating departments or agencies) on postsecondary education. Most of the inquiries, as Lou Bender's excellent recent research summary discloses,[13] examine the impact of federal laws and regulations on the operations of institutions. Few have examined the influence on statewide planning and coordination; and none have looked at this in terms of regionalism. This our current study proposes to do in some depth and detail.

Conclusion: Toward a Better Strategic Definition

This paper must close on an open-ended note, satisfying or disappointing as this may be to its audience here. Hopefully, some better insight was provided into regionalism and regionalization as an unfolding strategy for postsecondary education to meet the shifting conditions of the late 70s and 80s. Regionalism may over time come to be seen as the operational manifestation of the ideas encompassed in other phrases now showing up in various ways in the literature of postsecondary education. One for example, is the notion of "communiversity" defined to mean a complex of all postsecondary educational resources brought together to meet totally the diverse postsecondary educational needs of sizeable population centers or geographic areas.[14] In all candor, the full impact and potential of regionalism cannot be fully judged at this time. It shows sufficient development and gives evidence of attracting enough notice to merit continued and more refined improvement as well as analytical study. For the moment, however, we must settle by refining to its nature as well as its potential as "yet undefined."

NOTES

[1] For example: Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, *New Students and New Places*, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971; *The Fourth Revolution*, 1971; and *Toward A Learning Society*, 1971.

[2] Joseph M. Cronin. "The Interdependence of Higher Education," *Daedalus*, Vol. 104, Winter, 1975. pp. 108-112.

[3] S.V. Martorana and W. Gary McGuire. *Regionalism and Statewide Coordination of Postsecondary Education*. The Pennsylvania State University, Center for the Study of Higher Education. Report #26. September, 1976.

[4] S.V. Martorana, James Messersmith, and Lawrence Nelson, *Cooperative Projects Among Colleges and Universities*. Circular No. 649, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.: GPO, 1961.

[5] Lewis D. Patterson, *1975 Consortium Directory*, Washington, D.C.: AAHE, 1975. p.v.

[6] Franklin Patterson, *Colleges in Consort*. San Francisco, California: Jossey-Bass, 1974.

[7] Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, *More Than Survival: Prospects for Higher Education in a Period of Uncertainty*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1975.

[8] Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr., "Beyond the Open Door, The Open College," *Community and Junior College Journal*. XLV (August/September, 1974), 6-12.

[9] Higher Education Amendments of 1972, Sections 1202 and 1203.

[10] Alan J. Sturtz, "Decision-Making of State Coordinating Boards for Community Colleges and Local Community College Governing Boards in Certain Administrative Policy Areas." (Unpub. Ed.D. Disseration). The Pennsylvania State University, 1976.

[11] S.V. Martorana, et al. CUPIR: Cooperative Utilization of Private Institutional Resources: A Multifaceted Thrust for the Private Junior Colleges. The Pennsylvania State University, Center for the Study of Higher Education, October 1974.

[12] See for example several articles in Compact Vol. II, No. 1, Winter, 1977; and Edward J. Meade, Jr., "Is Law Polluting Our Schools," Phi Delta Kappan. Vol. 58, No. 6. February, 1977, pp. 478.

[13] Louis Bender, Federal Regulation and Higher Education, Research Report #1. ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education. One Dupont Circle, Washington, D.C., 1977.

[14] S.V. Martorana and Eileen Kuhns, "Communiversity: A New Challenge," Change, Vol. 9, No. 2, February, 1977. pp. 54-55.

"A Third Version of the Community College: The Contract College--An Analysis for State Planners"

by

Louis W. Bender
Director, State and Regional Higher Education Center
Florida State University

The postsecondary education institutional form developed by and indigenous to the United States known as the community college evolved in cadence with the emergence of the middle manpower spectrum of contemporary society. Prior to World War II, there were only two primary manpower levels, made up of the blue collar worker associated with a high school diploma and the white collar worker associated with management and the professions characterized by the baccalaureate and professional degrees awarded by college and universities. Following World War II, however, a new middle manpower level emerged to accommodate the complexities of a technological society employing automated approaches to industry and business. Positions for mid-management, para-professionals, and technicians requiring more than a high school education but less than a baccalaureate training have become the focus of community colleges as they provide certificate and associate degree programs which prepare individuals for entry at the middle manpower level. While some baccalaureate institutions have added this level to their mission and have developed two-year associate degree programs accordingly, the community college can claim uniqueness in having responded specifically to contemporary societal demands for a postsecondary institution which would accommodate the egalitarian press for access while also tailoring educational and training programs to the specific requirements of local business and industry needs.

Three prototypes of community colleges now exist. The most common and numerous type is the community college with a main campus which closely resembles any other collegiate campus and boasts of its library as the "heart of the college," its classroom and laboratory buildings, its student center dedicated to the "socialization function" of higher education and related buildings and grounds which have typically been symbolic of "college" in the American mind. This pattern of campus-based community colleges is testimony of the perceptions and ambitions of the early fledgling institutions to be recognized and accepted as "institutions of higher education." During the early history, baccalaureate institutions looked down upon the two-year colleges as mere extensions of high school; therefore deliberate efforts to establish visible evidence of a collegiate institution occurred. State regulations were adopted during the early and mid-1960s to guarantee that local community college sponsors and boards of trustees would not attempt to make temporary and makeshift facilities become permanent arrangements. Regulations in New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Florida, Illinois, and many other states required the newly approved colleges to submit campus and facilities development plans which would guarantee some kind of permanent campus being created within a specified period of time; as brief as three years in several states.

The second prototype of community college, the "without walls" community college, began to emerge at the end of the 1960s when it became apparent that the financial requirements from public funds at the local and state level for capital and operating costs were far greater than many had imagined. The early disciples and the missionaries who "preached the gospel of the community college" had established a mind set of low cost education to the student and to the public sponsors as well. Many legislators mistakenly interpreted that message to mean that the costs of facilities and programs would be minimal as visions of "cheap" but "quality" education were created. Resistance to sponsorship and establishment of new community colleges on the basis of cost become a subtle motivating factor in the establishment of "without walls" community colleges such as the Community College of Vermont, Whatcom Community College in Washington, Austin Community College in Texas, and Wor-Wic Technical Community College in Maryland. It is essential to recognize the positive underlying philosophical motives for these institutions which also led to their beginnings. Each of the institutions just named were deliberately designed to take education to the people through an outreach commitment. This philosophy was a product of a society which had come to accept the community college as having its own integrity and thus excellence was measured by how well a given institution carried out the community college mission rather than how well it mirrored or compared with a given baccalaureate institution. It had become respectable, even admirable, for an institution to champion excellence in occupational programs or in remedial or developmental education services. As a result, community college leaders began to realize that an institution would be judged by the public on its programs and services more than upon the beauty or size of its campus.

The "without walls" community college is very much like the typical community college except that it has no main campus and permanent facilities. By design, the college administration and faculty utilize a variety of existing facilities located throughout the service area such as churches, fire halls, granges, school buildings after regular hours, store fronts, and other available space that can be used for class meetings. These institutions typically develop cooperative arrangements whereby laboratory experiences can take place either in academic facilities or real-life settings within business or industry. The faculty and staff of the community college identify with the institution and view it as an entity having vitality and an institutional substance or "being." While the outreach philosophy may be different, the "without walls" community college is comparable to the first prototype with the exception that there is no permanent campus or facilities.

The third prototype and most recent to emerge, is the "contract" community college. This institution is a legal entity in the same manner as the other two prototypes. It is legally recognized by the state, and has the power to sue and be sued as any other institution. The distinguishing characteristic of this prototype is the fact that it contracts with other existing institutions to provide the educational programs and services it wishes to offer within its service area. As conceptualized, the "contract" community college would not have a permanent campus and facilities or its own permanent faculty. Personnel directly employed by the college would be a small administrative complement which would carry out the functions of community needs assessment, student recruitment and admission, determination of educational programs and services required for the student clientele, identification and contracting with appropriate institutions or organizations to provide the desired programs and services, and functions associated with budgeting, accounting, and evaluation of overall operations.

Historical Perspective

The historical diversity and individuality of the 50 states can be found in the development of community college education in America. Even the term community college is not universally used among the states to describe the public two-year comprehensive institution being examined although most of you will have no difficulty in applying the term for the institutions in your state. Whether called a community college, a junior college, a technical institute, or simply called a college, it is the public less-than-baccalaureate level institution committed to postsecondary education access and preparing people for the middle manpower spectrum of jobs. As the states enacted laws providing for the establishment of such institutions, local initiative and local support became a strategic determinant of whether or not a new institution would be established. Many states sought to develop a statewide service-area boundary plan for community colleges which would insure that all citizens of the state would be eligible for services. In many states, a requirement that local financial support for a specified percent of the community college was written into the state law. This meant that authorization for establishment of an institution could only come about through a referendum from the electorate or by vote of a legally recognized taxing entity such as a governmental unit or a school district. Consequently, not all service areas opted to establish a community college and thus twenty-six states now have a "patchwork-like" configuration with some areas of the state encompassed by a community college and others not. It might be argued that the second and third prototype of community college came as a consequence of the failure of local initiative to provide for a community college universally in each state.

Shoemaker studied the factors which inhibited the establishment of community colleges in one state and found that problems of an inadequate tax base, sparse population, distance and topography as well as provincial attitudes mitigated against establishment of the community college in many parts of the state. He also found that opposition by existing institutions such as public or private colleges, vocational-technical schools, and branch campuses often resulted in blocking establishment of a proposed institution (1971, pp. 206-207). It might be deduced that the "without walls" community college has responded to certain of those problems or obstacles while the "contract" community college has responded to others.

Case-Study Descriptions

Four different contract community colleges which will be briefly described include: The Union County Coordinating Agency for Higher Education, The Hudson County Community College Commission (both in New Jersey), The John Wood Community College in Illinois, and The Wasco Area Educational District in Oregon. Following a description of each of these institutions, an analysis of various aspects of the contract college will be given.

The Union County Coordinating Agency: Special state legislation was necessary to create the Union County Coordinating Agency. The New Jersey Public Law of 1964, Chapter 18A, providing for the establishment of public county (community) colleges was amended in New Jersey Public Law 1968, Chapter 180 which provided the basis for establishment of the Union County Coordinating Agency in 1969. The intent of the amended law was to allow a county board of freeholders to create a public higher education agency which could contract for educational programs from existing colleges as an alternative to creating a new county (community) college. The Union County Coordinating Agency Board has the same powers as a county college board of trustees with the exception of the right of eminent domain.

The Union County Coordinating Agency contracts for educational programs and services with Union College, a two-year independent college founded in 1933 which provides academic programs in the arts and sciences. The second contracting institution is the Union County Technical Institute, a public institution founded in 1959 providing secondary and postsecondary vocational and technical training. Financial support of the institution is derived from the Union County Board of Freeholders, the local sponsor; the state; and student tuition. The funding formula is the same as with the county community colleges of the state.

Literature used with the public has employed the title of "Union County's Community College System". A very small central staff assumes responsibility for public information, advisement of prospective students and contractual agreements with the two cooperating institutions. Degree granting authority resides only with Union College rather than with the Union County Coordinating Agency. Students seeking a degree in an occupational area can only do so in special programs where the Technical Institute and Union College have established cooperative arrangements. There are no provisions in the law allowing for contracts outside of Union County. The policy body for the Agency is made up of nine members who statutorily are representative of the participating contractual institutions and the general public. They are charged with coordination of the use of facilities associated with the educational services to qualified county residents and for reimbursing the participating institutions in accordance with state legislation and contractual agreements.

The Hudson Community College Commission: This legal entity was created in response to further legislative action in New Jersey

Public Law 1974, Chapter 89 which authorized the New Jersey State Board of Higher Education to approve a "community college agency" which was defined as an educational institution established by one or more sponsoring counties to offer instruction similar to that authorized under Public Law 1968, Chapter 180 providing for the Union County Agency. Several distinguishable differences were provided, however, including authority of the new community college agency to award degrees and enter into contracts with as many and as different institutions or organizations as desired to provide community college education services.

The Hudson Community College Commission is a public agency which contracts with three senior institutions -- Jersey City State College, St. Peter's College, Steven's Institute of Technology -- and other educational institutions including the Hudson County Vocational Technical School. The agency "matches student needs with available educational opportunities at any college or postsecondary institution in New Jersey" and has no full-time faculty or permanent facilities of its own. It is purported that this contractual approach reduces competition among the institutions while saving the taxpayers the financial burden of duplicating physical facilities and competing public programs.

The Hudson Community College Commission development was stimulated by an Exxon Educational Foundation Grant in 1972 which suported a feasibility study which was carried out under the direction of Joseph P. O'Neill and which was published in March, 1973. The Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE) awarded a $225,000 grant to a consortium called the Hudson Higher Education Consortium and was composed of the three baccalaureate colleges which are now contracting institutions. This arrangement was in existence when the state legislature took action on the 1974 Law and contributed to the design of that legislation. In this case, a voluntary consortium sought legislation which would create a legal entity under the county or community college legislation of the state and which would empower that entity with all duties, jurisdiction and authority vested in a traditional county or community college with the exception of the power of eminent domain.

The Hudson Community College Commission describes its operating philosophy as an "educational brokering approach." Four centers in different parts of the country which provide interviewing, career counseling, testing, program planning, and related services to accommodate the interests and needs of potential students. A center staff attempts to tailor a planned program of courses and activities in any combination of the participating contracting institutions which meet each student's goals. Certificates of competence or associate degrees may be awarded by the Commission or, in some cases, by the contracting institution depending upon the specific plan developed between the student and the Commission, acting as the "broker".

The Hudson Community College Commission has also established its own evening program of credit courses applicable to a two-year associate degree and non-credit courses and services available for interested adults and community groups. Thus another difference between Hudson and Union can be found in the fact that part-time faculty, at least, are being employed by the Hudson County Community College Commission.

John Wood Community College: This college was established in 1974 and is a part of the Illinois Community College System serving District #539. It serves a five-county area in Illinois as well as portions of the adjoining state of Missouri. It was established pursuant to the Public Community College Act of the General Assembly of the State of Illinois, Chapter 122, and is empowered under Section 3-40 of that law to enter into contracts for educational services with any person, organization, association, or governmental agency. It has degree-granting authority as well as powers and jurisdiction provided to all other community colleges in Illinois.

The operating philosophy of the John Wood Community College has been developed around "a 'common market' approach to education." Five postsecondary institutions presently are under contract with three private colleges -- Quincy College, Culver-Stockton College, and Hannibal-LaGrange College -- and two proprietary vocational-technical oriented institutions -- Gem City College and Quincy Technical School. John Wood Community College confers three associate degrees including the Associate of Arts, the Associate of Science, and the Associate of Applied Science degrees. It has no instructional facilities or full-time faculty although it, like the Hudson Community College Commission, has hired "part-time teacher coordinators" in agriculture to serve its remote communities and areas. The common market concept is intended to provide qualified students with programs and services without duplicating facilities or personnel. The administrative complement of the institution assumes a responsibility for promoting educational programs and services among the citizenry and for finding ways to facilitate admission, counseling, program planning, and evaluation of courses which meet the needs and goals of individuals turning to the community college. While existing institutions in New Jersey seem to have been instrumental in the original concept and founding of the "contract" community colleges in New Jersey, the impetus in Illinois seemed to be from the state and local governmental levels. The boundary plan promulgated by the Illinois Community College Board represented a state pressure. Locally, it was felt that the sparseness of the geographic area encompassed in District #539 and the relatively low tax base necessitated a different approach from the typical community college. The "common market" concept and the subsequent contracting design of John Wood Community College was the result.

Wasco Area Educational District: The Wasco Area Educational District was formed in Oregon in 1976 and will not commence offering actual services until July of 1977. Located at The Dalles, the institution will provide its courses and services through contracts with Mt. Hood Community College and Blue Mountain Community College. At the present time, there are no other institutions identified for future contracting.

The Wasco Area Educational District was authorized by a vote of the electorate and has taxing authority, a distinguishing characteristic different from the three previously described institutions. It will not have degree-granting authority, however, until it is accredited by its regional accrediting body. Thus, the initial classes of students may need to receive their degrees from the contracting institutions rather than from the Wasco Area Educational District. Plans call for the contracting arrangements to be comparable with those previously described in this paper. Similarly, the concept of providing recruitment, student admission/counseling and advising services as well as testing, placement, and program planning are envisioned for this new institution.

Contract Colleges Analyzed

There are a number of obvious advantages to the contract college approach. For the students, the contract college provides immediate programs and services which are generally accepted qualitatively because they have been offered by recognized institutions. The credibility and positive reputation of the existing institutions offer instant legitimization, something which a flegling new community college would need to earn over several years of operation. In some cases, students who would not otherwise be able to attend a local private institution because of academic or financial barriers are able to sit side-by-side with regularly matriculated students. More importantly, however, is the fact contract college admissions procedures almost guarantee that personal and individual program planning will be carried out, something which is not done for incoming freshmen students at most institutions.

Advantages for the local sponsor are primarily economic. The Union County taxpayers have been saved more than $20 million according to descriptive literature for that institution. The John Wood Community College claims that its per student operating costs have been lower than would be the operating costs if it had employed its own faculty and support staff for comparable programs.

Existent postsecondary institutions within the contract community college service area benefit in a number of ways. First, competition of a low tuition public community college is avoided. Secondly, some of the contracting institutions have found that the financial income covers empty spaces, which otherwise would have added to the overall costs of operation, but now become income gathering. Another benefit which has been identified has been the subtle but positive influence upon faculty attitudes toward the "new student clientele" which is emerging as the lifelong education concept becomes a reality.

State planners need to examine a number of other factors associated with the contract community colleges. Before the concept can be embraced, serious study and consideration should be given to the following areas:

Authorization: At least 28 states* have conditions or

*Alabama
Alaska
Arizona
Arkansas
California
Colorado
Florida
Illinois
Iowa
Kentucky
Louisiana
Maryland
Michigan
Mississippi
Missouri
Montana
New Jersey
New Mexico
New York
Nevada
North Carolina
Ohio
Oklahoma
Oregon
Pennsylvania
South Carolina
Texas
Wyoming

circumstances which would be conducive to the contract community college approach. They generally require local initiative since the institutions are not perceived as part of a state system; and/or there is some local support required in addition to state and student support; and/or there are areas of the state presently not encompassed by a community college service area. In order to utilize this approach, however, community college legislation would need to be amended or new legislation enacted. Strategic provisions in such legislation include consideration of whether the proposed entity should have degree-granting authority. In the case of Union County it would appear that the absence of such authority has placed the coordinating agency in a subservient role to its contracting college. The evidence would suggest that the architects of the legislation deliberately sought to place considerable power with Union College; however, in the process, the function of the coordinating agency became limited to a "funneling-type" of activity. Dependency of the agency upon degree-granting authority of the contracting college clearly weakens the agency and its ability to use the postsecondary education market place in tailoring programs for its student clientele. The Hudson County and John Wood institutions clearly gained stature and power from the degree-granting authority vested with them in the legislation.

Accreditation: An immediate question confronting institutional accrediting agencies is whether the contract community college itself should be evaluated or whether the accreditation of the individual contracting institutions should be the focus. The Hudson and John Wood institutions have sought and successfully been accredited by their respective regional accrediting associations. Since Union County does not have degree-granting authority, it is not eligible for accreditation. The visitation report for the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education of the North Central Association of Colleges and Universities reveals strong sentiment on the part of visiting team members that the John Wood Community College should ultimately secure its own faculty and develop its own program much like the "without walls" community colleges such as Watcom, Vermont, and Wor-Wic. Some of the internal problems of contracting institutions are identified through the accreditation process. For example, the question of price differentials exists, particularly for private contracting institutions, when students from the contract community college pay a low tuition and regularly matriculated students of the same private institution pay a traditional tuition. Another problem area requiring consideration is the question of the faculty and their supervision. Are the faculty of the contracting colleges under the jurisdiction of the community college...if not, how can the community college assure appropriate and qualitative programs...if so, what kind of friction develops between administrators of the separate colleges and the community college? How is faculty evaluation carried out and by whose standards and criteria? Another difficult area relates to the impact of the community college on registration procedures, grading policies, admissions standards and so forth. Does the contract community college necessarily force uniformity and commonality of procedures, forms, and standards upon the contracting institutions?

It becomes clear that the present format and standards of regional accrediting associations do not lend themselves to evaluation of the contract community college. It has been done, nevertheless, and successfully. Yet, the evidence is clear that the visiting teams favor the contracting approach to be a transitional rather than a permanent approach. In the case of John Wood and Hudson, at least, accreditation has represented a force or pressure upon the contract community college to move toward becoming an outreach institution with its own faculty, its own program, and thus ultimately abandon the dependence upon contracting with existing institutions like the without walls model.

The Contract: When state planners consider the contract community college as a possible approach for meeting the lifelong education needs and middle manpower spectrum requirements of their state, serious consideration should be given to the contract itself used by the contract community college. A number of important considerations must have been decided before entering into the contract. The term or length of the contract is one consideration. Some favor a year-to-year contract. From the perspective of the contract community college, such short-term obligation fosters flexibility in seeking out other possible institutions or organizations which could provide desired services. Yet there are those who would argue that the community college could be weakened should some of the cooperating institutions suddenly decide not to provide spaces or continue contracting. From the point of view of the cooperating institutions, one-year contracts are seen by some as desirable in order to guarantee that pricing of contracted services will reflect inflationary and other unanticipated increased costs while another group would argue that an institution is victimized if it does not have assurance of long-term continuity, particularly where additional resources are secured to offer new or expanded programs to accommodate the new clientele of the community college.

Another contract provision which often become politicized is the question of student services and activities and the institutional identity of the community college students. Should such students pay the student fee of the contracting college and participate as any other registered student at the institution or should the contract community college attempt to develop its own identity through student activities, institutional insignias on T-shirts, jackets, and so forth?

A third important provision in the contract relates to accounting aspects of the community college students and billing procedures. How much does the contract community college pay for a student who withdraws after one or two weeks? How does the contracting college relate its grading and probation policies to community college students? How does the community college make sure its students are not "channeled" into the classes of less effective or popular faculty? Who has responsibility for judging the quality of the courses and programs involved?

It is readily apparent that the contract community college must be more thorough and meticulous in drawing up a contract for services than many institutions have been in developing or codifying institutional policies. A considerable amount of visionary planning must go into the development of the contract if the interests of all parties -- students, cooperating institutions, and the contract community college -- are to appropriately accommodated.

Meeting Community Needs: The contract community college which aspires to fulfill the mission of the community-based institution will soon find that the services of existing post-secondary institutions do not lend themselves to that area known as community services. Of the four institutions studied, Wasco Area Educational District may be the exception since it will be contracting with two community colleges only, although it is doubtful whether those institutions will provide community services in the area of the Dalles. Both the John Wood and Hudson institutions have already employed part-time community education faculty in order the meet the community service goals of their institution. Apparently, some subtle difficulties have occurred for both institutions because of this commitment. There is evidence of criticism on the part of some that such part-time staffing does not assure high standards consistent with the full-time programs of the contracting institutions and inadequate provisions exist for appropriate supervision and management of such activities. Advocates, on the other hand, argue that the contract community colleges should broaden and expand such part-time staffing and programming to meet additional educational needs, even those full-time credit and degree programs not available from existing institutions in the area. The situation is ripe, therefore, for possible disagreements and strained relations between and among the various institutions.

The counseling/advisement function of the contract community college can be viewed as a community service function where the institution attempts to serve any of the citizenry seeking help. This area has also become politicized with some criticism directed at the costs involved and other criticism directed at the outreach nature of such services. There is some evidence to suggest that the contract community college is perceived as being available much as a campus-based admissions and counseling office. But the staff of the four contract community colleges studied seem oriented toward and motivated to provide outreach throughout the service area and to become effective human-resource centers very much like the brokering process or approach being described in Fran Macy's module.

Summary

State planners charged with designing postsecondary education opportunities which accommodate the lifelong learning needs of a pluralistic society must examine the community college as one of the significant delivery approaches. A truly American institution, the community college emerged in response to the beginning and subsequent evolution of the middle manpower spectrum of our contemporary technological society. Furthermore, the community college, through its open-door philosophy, responds to the public demand for access to postsecondary educational opportunity.

Three community college prototypes have been described including the traditional campus-oriented institution, the "without walls" community college, and the most recent type to emerge, the "contract" community college. Illustration of the without walls community college can be seen in Austin Community College in Texas, the Community College of Vermont, Whatcom Community College in Washington, and Wor-Wic Technical Community College in Maryland. Each of these institutions have their own faculty and staff but do not have any central or permanent campus. Their outreach philosophy is accommodated by utilizing a variety of existing facilities located throughout their service area which typically are borrowed, rented, or leased on a short-term basis.

The third version of the community college, the "contract" community college delivers its services through contracting with existing postsecondary institutions or organizations which either accommodate the students of the community college by having them occupy empty spaces in regular classes or design special courses of study and programs to serve the educational goals and needs of the community college student.

The latest two versions of the community college developed as consequence of historical factors which mitigated against the establishment of the traditional campus-type institution. Sparcity of population, low or limited tax base and topography often represented obstacles which could not be overcome without some kind of special design. In other areas, private and/or public postsecondary institutions already in existence represented a resource even though their individual programs did not totally serve the community college education needs of the local citizenry. The contract community college became a mechanism for increasing services and programs available to the local service area while capitalizing upon already existent institutional resources.

Four contract community colleges have been described briefly. The Union County Coordinating Agency, the oldest of the four, was established under community college legislation in New Jersey but does not have degree-granting authority and thus has not been separately accredited by the Middle States Association. The Hudson Community College Commission in the same state, on the other hand, does have degree-granting authority and has been accredited. It presently contracts with three senior institutions and a vocational-technical school. In an effort to provide additional programs not available through the contracting institutions and at different times of the day or evening, the Hudson Community College Commission has employed part-time faculty to teach in its evening credit and non-credit programs. Operating on an "educational broker" philosophy of approach, this institution has been more autonomous than its Union counterpart.

The John Wood Community College in Illinois operates on a "common market" approach and is very much like the Hudson model. It contracts with three private colleges and two proprietary vocational-technical institutions offering services not only in the state of Illinois but in adjacent Missouri as well. In carrying out its "common market" philosophy, the institution has also employed a part-time faculty to offer programs and provide counseling/advisement services in remote parts of its service area.

The fourth contract community college described is the Wasco Area Educational District which was formed in 1976 in Oregon. It will provide its services through contracting with Mt. Hood Community College and Blue Mountain Community College when it commences offering actual services in July of 1977.

State planners need to analyze the contract college approach in order to examine the many strengths and some weaknesses which are involved. Students served by contract community colleges probably would have not enjoyed postsecondary educational services through a locally sponsored institution if the state were to insist upon traditional standards and criteria promulgated in the statutes and regulations of most states. In fact, it would be necessary for most states to amend existing community college legislation or adopt new regulations in order to permit establishment of a contract community college. Before doing so, however, state planners should study the kind of authorization which would best achieve a vital and responsive contract institution and which would qualify for regional accreditation. Analysis of contractual provisions and strategies for meeting community needs should also occupy serious study by the state planner before taking action.

Thank you.

References

"A Descriptive History of the Hudson Community College Commission" (including 23 pages on Educational Brokerage applications). Mimeographed. 35 pages.

Commission on Colleges "Status Team Report on Hudson Community College Commission." Middle States Association on Colleges and Schools. April, 1975. Mimeographed. 3 pages.

Commission on Institutions of Higher Education, "Report of a Visit to John Wood Community College, Quincy, Illinois." North Central Association of Colleges and Schools. December, 1975. Mimeographed. 18 pages.

The Hudson County Community College, "Evening College Centers." August, 1975. Mimeographed. 11 pages.

Hudson County Community College Commission. Miscellaneous papers and documents including contract agreements, handbooks, position descriptions, news clippings, etc.

John Wood Community College. Miscellaneous papers and documents including contract agreements, handbooks, position descriptions, news clippings, etc.

MacKay, Kenneth C. Annual Report of the Union County Coordinating Agency for Higher Education. 1972; 1974; and 1975.

__________________ "Serving Community Needs Through Inter-institutional Cooperation." Undated. Mimeographed. 13 pages.

New Jersey Public Law 1964, Chapter 18.

New Jersey Public Law 1968, Chapter 180.

New Jersey Public Law 1974, Chapter 89.

Shoemaker, Elwood A. A Study of the Factors Inhibiting Establishment of Community Colleges in Pennsylvania. An unpublished dissertation. Temple University, 1971.

Union County Coordinating Agency for Higher Education, "Twoard Unification, A Timetable." October 7, 1974. Mimeographed. 12 pages.

Union County Coordinating Agency. Miscellaneous papers and documents including contract agreements, handbooks, position descriptions, news clippings, etc.

Wasco Area Educational District. Miscellaneous papers and documents including contract agreements, handbooks, position descriptions, news clippings, etc.

"Case Study #1: The 'Without Walls' Type: Community College of Vermont"

by

Peter P. Smith
President, Community College of Vermont

Case Study: The Community College of Vermont

Funded by an OEO grant when it was established in 1970, the Community College of Vermont (CCV) has dedicated itself to serving those adults who have no other access to appropriate education. A community-based, competency-based college without a campus, CCV enables Vermonters to continue their education at home, taking courses nearby from instructors who often live in the students' own communities. The college is open to any resident of the state, regardless of age, financial situation, geographic location, or previous educational experience. CCV concentrates its services and efforts especially on people who have been discouraged in the past by high tution costs, distance from campuses, family or job responsibilities, or limiting admissions policies. At $35 per course, the college has the lowest tuition in the state.

The college provides quality education at reduced cost by avoiding the duplication of existing services and by using the talent and facilities already available in Vermont communities. The community is the "campus": classes are held in local schools, offices, banks, factories, churches -- wherever communities have donated space for CCV's use. A class in auto mechanics may meet at a service station, a creative-writing class in a public library, and a psychology class in a local church.

Instructors are also drawn from the general community. Paid on a per-course basis, they usually hold full-time jobs in the community, practicing the skills they teach. A certified public accountant may teach accounting, an architect may instruct students in mechanical drawing, a town official may conduct a workshop in local government, the director of a day-care center may supervise the on-the-job training for a CCV student. The community college, in selecting competent teachers, values demonstrated knowledge in a field as much as formal education.

The CCV staff operates out of one central administrative office and nine field offices located throughout the state. Many outreach activities are directed from each of these field offices, thereby carrying learning opportunities and materials even further into Vermont's rural communities. The staff talks enthusiastically of "taking learning experiences to students instead of making students come to college." As might be expected, recruiting students is a nonexistent activity at CCV. Time, effort, and funds are spent instead, on outreach -- literally, reaching out to take services and resources to Vermont's adults as they continue to work and live in their own communities. Not just "community-based," the college might almost be said to be "community-placed."

Full-time staff members at the college do not teach, in the traditional sense of the term. Other than the fifteen or so individuals who make up the administration, CCV's staff members spend their time and energy on counseling students or guiding instructors. The members of the instructor-support staff, known as "coordinators of instruction," have three major responsibilities: through the use of questionnaires and contact with the community, they determine the community's needs for learning; by meeting and talking with community leaders, merchants, churchmen, and so forth, they secure space and facilities for college use; and, in interviews and discussions, they orient instructors and prospective instructors to the community college philosophy, give them instructional guidance and media support, and generally provide them with a person to turn to at any point during their teaching experience with the non-traditional college.

Counselors, referred to collectively as "student support," make up the greater portion of the full-time field staff. Whereas there may be only one or two coordinators of instruction for each region in which the college operates, counselors work out of each of the nine field offices. As the title of their division of the staff implies, they support students by providing advice, counseling, and direction. Rather than teaching content, these CCV staff members are dedicated to teaching the process of learning.

CCV students receive neither grades nor credits. Instead, the two-year associate degree is awarded on the basis of demonstrated skills and the acquisition of competencies agreed upon in advance. Each student desiring a degree meets regularly with a CCV counselor to draw up a "contract," which defines the student's goals in a chosen area of study. It is this process of "contracting" that forms the bulwark of CCV's commitment to learning. Past work experience can be evaluated and included in a study plan. Learning outside the classroom is encouraged. On-the-job training, apprenticeships, and independent study are important in many CCV students' learning programs. At the end of each course or learning experience, the student writes a narrative evaluation of his own performance and the value to him of the course. On the same evaluation form, the instructor writes an evaluation of the student's progress and areas for improvement.

In addition to self-evaluation, evaluation by instructors, and consultation with counselors, each degree candidate meets periodically with a "local review committee." This advisory and evaluative group comprises a fellow student, a CCV staff member, a community instructor, and an additional community member chosen by the student. At regular intervals, the student meets with the review committee to evaluate progress toward the degree.

Three programs of study, each with its own set of competencies, lead to an associate degree: Administrative Services, a program of study for students seeking office or business management skills; Human Services, for those interested in counseling, teaching, or related professions; and General Studies, for students interested in other areas. The local review committee considers a program of study completed when the student can demonstrate the acquisition of the competencies and skills specified in the program.

A great number of CCV students enroll for a course or two each term and continue taking courses on a sporadic, nonprogrammed basis, depending on the time and money left available by family and job responsibilities. The average CCV student is fully employed during the day, has a family and a low income, and first enrolls in a CCV evening or weekend course to improve job skills, to acquire a craft or hobby, or just "to get out of the house." The college offers a wide range of courses in crafts, physical recreation, and home arts. Offerings in printing, auto mechanics, home plumbing, and yoga are perennially popular. When students do require credits for transfer to other institutions, the college uses the guidelines of the Carnegie Unit to arrive at semester-hour equivalent credits, depending on the amount of time spent in class.

CCV provides different types of students with a variety of instructional settings. Classes, independent study, experiential learning, and on-the-job training are all options made available to a diversity of learners. A fifth instructional model is the Cluster, a support group of students who meet together regularly to discuss with others their own problems, goals, hopes, and fears. This model is seen as most effective for those students who would be reluctant, for a variety of personal and educational reasons, to pursue their own education without peer support. Gradually, these students become more independently involved in courses and other learning experiences, but they return periodically to the Cluster for support and feedback.

The Community College of Vermont has gone to great lengths in its first five years to make learning a lifelong resource for Vermont's people. In December, 1975, its nontraditional, noncampus, community and competency-based system received full accreditation by the New England Association of Schools and Colleges, Inc. A member of the state colleges system since 1972, the college now enables the state to deliver fully accredited, postsecondary education to adults who otherwise would have no access to it. The flexibility and variety of its instructional models, planning, management, and budgeting are all effectively bringing learners together with resources.

Case Study: A Student - Donna

Donna Cobb was a housewife and mother of two children. She had always enjoyed raising her family and maintaining their home. However, as the children reached high school age and became more independent, Donna became restless. She decided to find a part-time job to help meet the household expenses.

With only a high school diploma and no past work experience, it was hard for Donna to find a good job. Finally, after weeks of frustration she secured a job as a cashier in the local market. At the same time Donna resolved to learn typing so that eventually she could become a secretary.

One of Donna's friends had mentioned taking evening courses at the Community College of Vermont so she inquired about typing there. When she arrived at the College's office she spoke with a counselor who described the course offerings for Fall semester and explained the counseling and financial aid services available. Donna would register for her first college class two weeks later.

During her first semester at the Community College, Donna attended a typing class one evening a week. It was difficult to arrange her family schedule to free hereself for class and practice time, but Donna really enjoyed learning her new skill. She enjoyed it so much in fact that she decided to take another course during the following semester.

Upon looking over the Spring listing of courses, Donna noticed that CCV granted an associate degree and decided to inquire about it. Assuming that a degree was a practical impossibility, Donna apologetically asked her Community College counselor about the degree. To her surprise Donna discovered that other working mothers in similar situations had received degrees. Donna also learned that she would play a major part in the design of her degree plan. Though she was apprehensive about her own skills, Donna became eager to try to plan a degree. Anxiously, she enrolled in a course designed to help her do just that.

While preparing her degree plan, Donna researched the business field in order to understand the demands of office occupations, looked at the course requirements of other community colleges around the country, and examined her own interests within the business field. In addition, she identified skills she had already acquired through her high school experience or through experiences outside of school.

Donna discovered that she had talents she had never recognized before. She realized that she had developed some outstanding interpersonal skills while raising her children and participating in PTA. She had also become a polished seamstress during years of making her family's clothes.

Donna wrote a degree plan which included her assessment of those past learnings as well as her objectives for becoming a competent administrative worker. Donna had decided that she needed to increase her typing skills; to acquire a basic understanding of business management; and, because she had a special interest in history, to learn all that she could about Vermont history. These and other learning goals were included in her plan. Now Donna was ready to meet with her review committee to receive their suggestions about her degree.

At the first meeting with her committee Donna was encouraged by the committee's enthusiasm over her plan. Their primary recommendation was that she consider adding bookkeeping to her list of desired skills. At the end of the meeting the committee members volunteered to help Donna either individually or as a group throughout her stay at Community College.

Donna continued to take one course a semester and began to set up other learning experiences to fulfill her contract. She spent one day a week during one semester practicing her typing and bookkeeping skills in an on-the-job learning experience in a doctor's office. She also visited one of her review committee members to observe the variety of record keeping methods used in his company.

After three years of study and frequent contact with her review committee for opinions and suggestions, Donna knew that she had become a competent secretary. In fact, she had accepted a job as the office manager at the local Chamber of Commerce.

Donna began to wrap up her degree document by listing all of the skills she had acquired and by checking that she had evidence of her comptence. When she was satisfied with the document, she asked the committee to review it again, telling them that she believed that she was ready for a degree. The local review committee agreed.

There was little question that Donna was ready for an associate degree. She had acquired the office skills necessary for a responsible position, she had begun her own small business on the side selling homemade children's clothing, and had exposed herself to a wide range of disciplines through her course selection. More importantly though, Donna had gained confidence in her abilities and the tools for determining and fulfilling her own goals.

Case Study: Some Obstacles and Solutions

The Community College of Vermont has experienced and survived a roller-coaster-ride of successes and opposition since its inception in 1970. Although they might appear to be interrelated as well as sequential, the opposition and obstacles faced by the college have been, in fact, neither. It is fare more illuminating to see them thematically and situationally, focussing, as they do, on the four general issues of institutional legitimacy, financing, duplication of effort, and program quality. With the exception of financing, the perenial bugbear of any new (not to mention old) educational model, the other themes are all directed at the essential credibility of the program. Those of us who might spend our time either planning or implementing lifelong learning programs would do well to advance on these potentially threatening questions with serious intent and thereby turn them to our advantage. If the questions are well answered, then the problem of financing will be inestimably helped.

Although they will occur time and again in differing situations, the basic questions which we have confronted are these:

1. Legitimacy: What is your derivation, governmental or other? In short, where did you come from and who said you could? The Community College of Vermont was first recommended by a Governor's Task Force on Technical Education as an economic approach to the emerging postsecondary educational needs of Vermont's adults. Formed first as the Vermont Regional Community College Commission (VRCCC) through an Executive Order of the Governor in 1970, the college formally came of age with its entry into the Vermont State College system in 1972.

2. Duplication: What is the need for your operation? Aren't there already a whole slew of local and continuing education programs which can fill the bill?

There are, in fact, many local opportunities for adult learners already existing in the state of Vermont. That is precisely why the Community College of Vermont was established in its current form, with no facilities and no permanent faculty. Consequently, we can program with learners, in response to their needs, harnessing the rich local human, physical, and programmatic resources which already exist. What the college adds to the mix is the sequence of services which can translate a panoply of opportunity into a postsecondary educational program which meets the needs of the students.

3. Quality: What good is it? Any college which has neither the facilities nor faculty has to be a pretty bad place. That is a reasonable question, because any college should be able to talk to you about what they do well, why, and how. At CCV, we developed a competency-based contract approach to the Certificate and Associate Degree program as well as all individual learning experiences. This way, the learner, the instructor, and the college are talking about what the learner knows and can do as a result of the learning experience. This is absolutely necessary because the college has chosen not to use the traditional input indicators of quality upon which traditional colleges rest their claims. However, we also feel that it is a preferable route to go in any case. Clear statements about what has been learned within a competence framework of the student's and college's design is simply going to lead to better evaluation. Interestingly enough, our learners, both graduates and peripatetic, have enjoyed significant success economically, in further education, and in their personal and community lives. Although we have a long way to go in improving our learning support system, we do feel that it allows for the very highest quality learning within the context of the community.

These are clearly only the beginnings of complete answers to what are obviously very complex questions. However, from them I believe that we can infer some simple approaches when a lifelong learning program is being developed.

Don't Refute, Educate!

In most cases, the people who raise questions do so to get an answer. The program developer must work hard to anticipate the questions, develop clear answers, and present them to the questioner(s) in a specific manner. Refutations are not effective as responses to questions. Data, metaphors, and stories which illuminate the purposes and worth of the endeavor do work well.

Often, questions get at the unconscious question, "Why are you different?" In my experience, the best responses answer a better question, "What are we intended to achieve?" The two questions are vitally different because the first compares the program with other programs for validation while the second compares the program with its purposes. Consequently, information which answers questions while focusing on the college's purposes has always been helpful.

Know the Constituency of the Program

As important as a good pre-plan is, any new program must move quickly to develop a critical mass of consumers with accompanying "impact" information. These are both ways to display the distinctiveness, necessity, and utility of a new lifelong learning program. If decision makers meet people, both in person and through data, who have been well served, it supports the likelihood of positive decisions.

Distinguish Pattern From Function

There appears to be a fundamental confusion underlying much of the criticism and/or questioning of lifelong learning programs such as the Community College of Vermont. It is the confusion of pattern (how education is delivered) with function (what education is delivered). All to often, decision makers question the pattern without even considering the function. For example, there are several methodologies for the functional evaluation of learning. Faculty evaluating learning with exams is a common pattern of evaluation. Consequently, if your program handles evaluation differently (as mine does) and questions about the quality of program evaluation arise, it may be useful to tease out questions of function from those of pattern. Having made this distinction, it can be shown how, although the pattern is different, the necessary function is present. While very few people would agree to an absence of evaluation in a postsecondary program, many more might agree to a different placement of the evaluative function. In any case, decision makers are well assisted by understanding what the pattern is, what the function is, and where they fit together.

Conclusion

The Community College of Vermont has survived and prospered by listening carefully, answering helpfully, and attempting to convince by educating. The obstacles which confront any new lifelong learning program should be answered clearly, simply, and educationally for the interrogator. While it may seem easier and more exciting to publish broadsides about the "need" for a program or its innovative nature, it is far more effective to see the obstacles as needs for "bread and butter" information and to supply that information in a hard-headed, clear manner which clarifies the procedures and purposes of the colleges or programs in question. While none of this will automatically quiet the skeptics, it does honor our collective endeavor by presenting it from the strong base provided by educational thought and recent experience.

FOOTNOTES

[1] Gollatscheck, et. al., The Community Development College, 1976, pp. 90-93.

[2] Community College of Vermont, Local Review Committee Handbook, 1976, pp. 1-2.

"Case Study #2: The 'Contract College' Type: John Wood Community College

by

Paul R. Heath
President, John Wood Community College

Introduction

John Wood Community College was organized as Illinois Community College District Number 539 following the election of the Board of Trustees in November, 1974. The College received a formal certificate of recognition from the State of Illinois Community College Board in July of 1975 with renewal granted in July, 1976. The certificate is an indication that the College has met all of the state requirements and thereby qualifies for state apportionment claims, state grants, and financial aid.

The College is governed by a seven-member Board of Trustees who are elected at large from the District. The President is the Chief Administrative Officer and reports to the Board of Trustees. John Wood Community College is the newest Community College in Illinois and the only college in the state, or nation, to operate almost exclusively through contractual relationships with private and proprietary schools.

History of Illinois Community Colleges

The Community College movement began in the state of Illinois. After the initiation of a post-high school program in Joliet in

1902, a number of school districts followed Joliet's example, and thus, in effect, began a junior college program without specific legal sanction. In 1931, the first legislation enabled Chicago to operate a junior college program as part of its school system. Legislation validating existing downstate junior colleges and permitting the establishment of new ones came in 1937. In its 1951 session, the state legislature recognized the junior colleges as part of the public common school system, administered by local boards of education, subject to supervision by the State Superintendent of Public Instruction.

In 1965, the 72nd General Assembly passed the Illinois Public Community College Act, which enabled junior colleges and two-year colleges existing at the time to become part of the state higher education system and removed such colleges from the category of "common schools."

There were three different classes of junior colleges possible under the 1965 law: Class I -- state system junior colleges; Class II -- junior colleges which had separate tax rates, and individual boards, but which did not qualify or wish to join the state system; and grades 13 and 14 of common school district, a carryover from the old law to provide for colleges which did not have a tax rate separate from the common school. From the beginning, the Act envisioned the development through either local initiative or conversion of Class II Districts to a system of Class I junior colleges blanketing the state. To achieve the goal, financial incentives, in the form of seed money, increased state aid per semester hour or equivalent, and building funds up to 75 percent of the total cost of captial projects, were made available only to Class I districts, a practice that continues today, with variations in the funding formula.

The response was overwhelming. Within two and a half years from the passage of the Act, there were over 30 Class I junior college districts accepted or approved covering approximately 75 percent of the population of Illinois in 1967. Today, the state systems of Class I community colleges have expanded to a network of comprehensive community colleges on 49 campuses in 30 locally governed districts and one experimental district governed by the State Board itself, serving approximately 10.3 million population of the state. At the start of fall semester, 1976, student headcount enrollment amounted to over 325,000 with an FTE of over 154,000. The total community college headcount enrollment constituted nearly half of the total student enrollment in all of higher education in the state.

State Governance

The Illinois Community College Board is the body charged with the overall regulation, supervision, and planning for the community college system. It is composed of ten members. Eight of them are appointed by the governor with the advice and consent of the senate. The ninth is a non-voting student member selected by the recognized committee of students of the ICCB. Finally, the State Superintendent of Education serves as an ex-officio voting member. The eight regular members serve for terms of six years. The non-voting student member serves a one-year term.

Members of the ICCB must be state residents and citizens, selected as far as practicable on the basis of their knowledge of, or interest and experience in, problems of community colleges. However, the statute prohibits a member of the ICCB from being engaged in public employment for which he receives regular salary from public funds, or from being actively engaged in education as a profession or hold current membership on a school board of trustees of a public or non-public college, university or technical institute. Thus, a trustee, teacher, or administrator of a community college would have to resign that position upon assuming a position on the ICCB.

The ICCB members serve without compensation. They are, however, compensated for expenses actually incurred, and have the power to employ and fix the compensation of an executive officer and such employees as it deems necessary for the purposes of carrying out their legal function. The powers and duties of the ICCB include:

(a) Statewide planning and coordination for the community colleges;

(b) Feasibility surveys for new community colleges;

(c) Cooperation with the individual institutions in continuing studies of educational policy;

(d) Entering into intergovernmental contracts and to accept federal funds;

(e) Determining proper construction standards for community colleges;

(f) Determining standards for establishment of community colleges and site location; and

(g) Evaluation of new units of instruction, research or public service.

Additionally, the ICCB has the duty of establishing the various operational, administrative, and scholastic standards which the individual community colleges must meet, and to grant recognition to those institutions meeting such standards. Recognition by the ICCB is necessary in order for a community college district to qualify for state apportionment funding.

The ICCB has from the beginning treated John Wood Community College the same as every other community college in the state. The College is required to complete various planning documents and submit all reports under the state management information system. No modifications have been requested by either party and all deadlines have been met as to various state reports.

In addition to state recognition and state guidelines, the federal government has approved John Wood Community College for all federal programs. Students of John Wood are now eligible to receive Veterans Benefits, BEOG's, SEOG's, and also qualify for the workstudy programs. Prior to approval, the Office of Education sent a two man inspection committee to Quincy, Illinois, to evaluate the college operation. The report submitted to a review committee in Washington gave solid support to the concept and to the college operation.

College officials were also requested to give testimony to Representative O'Hara's Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education. The testimony was published in the Congressional Record entitled, Higher Education Act Amendments of 1976.

The ICCB is also empowered to promulgate, effectuate, and administer rules and regulations. Accordingly, the ICCB has published its Manual of Policies, Procedures and Guidelines, referred to as the "ICCB Manual." The policies section outlines the ICCB's general requirements for recognition, administration, instructional offerings, public service programs, learning resources, student services, finances, sites construction, and institutional studies. The procedures section describes the requirements necessary to implement the Board's policies.

In 1972, legislation was enacted which directed the ICCB to establish or otherwise provide for new districts or for the annexation to adjacent community college districts. Recent legislation has further encouraged, if not forced, all non-community college district territory to annex to established districts, by prohibiting public schools from levying taxes to support the "chargeback program." In effect the state is forcing all territory to be a part of the public community college system.

The Common Market Concept

The common market concept is a method of delivering educational services through contractual arrangements with other agencies in and near the community college district. There is nothing in the state statute to prohibit the contractual method of operation. Both the Illinois Community College Board and the Illinois Board of Higher Education have encouraged the sharing of resources to avoid duplication of efforts. In fact, Master Plan III conceived the idea of the common market and encouraged its development. No modification of state legislation was needed to form District 539 as a common market institution. The operation of the college is identical to all other community colleges in the state with the only difference being that instructional services are purchased, or contracted from private postsecondary institutions.

The College Operation

John Wood Community College, with administrative offices and non-traditional classrooms located in Quincy, Illinois, serves five counties with a population base of nearly 100,000 persons. The design of the contractual common market concept has a philosophical base of utilization of all educational resources in the area to provide comprehensive community college education opportunities to district residents. Thus, John Wood uses existing college and proprietary schools in Illinois, Missouri, and Iowa to provide instructional and support services for its students.

Currently, six schools are cooperating in the venture with JWCC. Culver-Stockton College, Canton, Missouri, and Quincy College, Quincy, Illinois, are four-year liberal arts colleges, while Hannibal-LaGrange College, Hannibal, Missouri, is a private two-year liberal arts college. Southeastern Community College is a public community college in Iowa which is in a position to serve JWCC residents living in the northwest section of the district. Gem City Business College, Quincy, Illinois, offers career programs in Business, Horology, and Fashion Merchandising; while Quincy Technical Schools, Quincy, Illinois, offers technical training in five fields of study; both are proprietary schools. In addition to the extensive two-year transfer offerings available through the liberal arts setting, career programs are offered in thirteen fields; Accounting, Agri-Business Management, Air Conditioning, Auto Body Repair, Auto Mechanics, Data Processing, Drafting and Design, Fashion Merchandising, Horology, Law Enforcement, Practical Nursing, Secretarial Science, and Welding. A variety of community service courses and seminars have also been held.

Students apply and are admitted to John Wood Community College with each student consulting with a JWCC counselor or advisor to plan an educational program. As a part of the counseling/advising session, the student's financial needs are assessed, with JWCC providing a full range of opportunities, encouraging students to apply for appropriate aid programs.

From among the courses offered at the common market institutions, and incidentally there are nearly 700 unique sections available each semester, the student selects the courses which will most readily lead him toward his educational objectives. The student registers for his classes, after proper advising sessions, with a copy of his registration going to the registrar of each school where he is taking classes. When classes begin, the student's name appears on a class list with "native" students of the contractual common market institution(s). The instructor has no way of knowing who is and who is not a JWCC student. At the end of the semester, grades are turned in by instructors to the appropriate registrars who forward the grades of JWCC students to the registrar at JWCC where they are recorded on the permanent transcript. The process is not really that simple for the college registrars involved, but is quite simple for the student.

JWCC counselors and other staff members maintain contact with students throughout their educational programs, and the full range of student services are provided including counseling, financial aid, student government, student activities, (including athletics) and placement.

The JWCC student pays $12 per semester hour of credit as an in-district resident. The common market colleges are paid on the basis of credit hour production, with a decreasing variable rate established which recognizes cost effectiveness of large numbers of students. The variable rate concept was introduced during negotiation sessions with different rates established at each institution, reflecting enrollment patterns and other expense factors for individual campuses. At Quincy College, the current rate is $50 per credit hour for the first 6,000 hours; $40 for the next 4,000 hours; $30 for the next 2,000 hours; and $20 for the next 2,000 hours. There has been some discussion to increase the rate if projected enrollments are surpassed, recognizing that increased costs may be associated with heavier than expected enrollments. Negotiated rates for instructional services differ at each institution, reflecting the uniqueness of each campus in relation to program costs. In one instance, the variable rate was discarded because laboratory stations restricted, or limited, the economy of increased enrollment.

In addition to the low tuition rate the student may purchase a student activity ticket for any of the five schools at the same price as "native" students. Each JWCC student is also entitled to use the libraries of all five schools, with a composite library of over 300,000 volumes.

Funding support r John Wood comes from four sources -- tuition and fees, state aid, local tax levy and federal monies. An initial budget of approximately $900,000 provided support for a student enrollment of over 800 including a JWCC staff of six administrators, several part-time professionals, four CETA paraprofessionals, six secretaries, and student workers. The FY77 budget was expanded to $1.6 million to accommodate over 1500 students in the second year of operation. A modest increase in personnel for FY77 has permitted improved services to the students.

The JWCC Board of Trustees was elected in the fall of 1974. Administrative and support staff were hired during the winter and spring with contract agreements reached with the common market schools in the summer of 1975 and classes beginning in August, 1975. Enrollment projections by the State of Illinois and knowledgeable consultants who worked on the College's feasibility study estimated 400 students for the 1975-76 school year and 1000 students by 1980. During the first summer, applications seemed to lag, and it looked as if enrollment would not reach the projection; but the concept caught on, and 670 students enrolled for the 1975 fall classes. By March, over 800 were enrolled, and projections called for 1200 students for the 1976 school year. By the end of the 1976 fall registration it was obvious that projections were light again as the headcount enrollment exceeded 1500 students. The 1977 spring enrollment figures will no doubt approach 2000 students.

From the very beginning JWCC sought recognition from the

North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. In March, 1976, the college received Candidate for Acceditation status with North Central, and a report submitted by the visiting evaluation team was very positive.

The quality of the programs and the soundness of the concept have been scrutinized and supported by several state agencies. All programs offered by John Wood must be approved by the local Trustees, the Illinois Community College Board (ICCB) and the Illinois Board of Higher Education (IBHE). The ICCB staff also must approve each course description submitted by JWCC.

Not every course is offered through the common market system. JWCC has its own Open Learning Center, a non-traditional delivery system whereby students can take a variety of developmental as well as college level courses on a self-paced mastery level basis. The College recently assumed sponsorship of a Licensed Practical Nursing program which had been previously handled by the Quincy Public Schools.

In addition, JWCC has embarked on an ambitious program, termed Project Outreach, designed to provide courses whenever and wherever they are needed in the JWCC district. Over 200 evening courses have been offered in seven communities spread throughout the district, which encompasses 1,821 square miles, so that residents are within 20 minutes of JWCC course offerings. While many instructors from the common market schools are engaged to teach these courses they are employed directly by JWCC as part-time adjuct faculty. Many courses have been designed for industrial and special interest groups including:

--A Spanish course for employees of the Harris Corporation which does considerable international sales to Spanish-speaking countries; employees take the course, taught by a Quincy College instructor, during their lunch hour three days a week.

--Seminars for food preparation service workers to prepare them for an examination recently required by the State of Illinois.

--An interdisciplinary humanities course in cooperation with area high schools and the Qunicy Society of Fine Arts; students listen to the artists explain their specialties, then attend concerts, art shows, etc., where the same artists perform.

--A securities seminar designed to assist businessmen in their efforts to combat "shoplifters."

--A special phramacology course for Licensed Practical Nurses; the course was designed by are hosptial personnel to upgrade LPN skills.

--Courses offered in conjunction with the American Institute of Banking.

--A unique summer gardening program which included shared garden plots.

--Sponsorship of the Retired Senior Volunteer Program.

--A public water treatment seminar for public water supply personnel to update their skills; this has been expanded into several 3-hour courses in water treatment.

For years educators have talked about cooperative efforts with little tangible results. Institutional paternalism and state restrictions have discouraged the efforts of those who proposed cooperative ventures. The common market may prove to be the vehicle to merge occupational and transfer programs, encouraging vocational education to become more liberal, while vocationalizing the concept of the liberal arts.

Advantages of the Common Market

First of all, the concept immediately permits a new community college to offer quality programs on a large scale. Taking advantage of the physical as well as human resources of established educational programs permits "the new college kid on the block" to be accepted almost immediately. The public is very cost-conscious and therefore accepts and encourages cooperative efforts that maximize the utilization of facilities and discourages tax supported building projects.

Secondly, not having to expand time and energies on building programs, the Board and Staff can concentrate on identifying community needs with appropriate programs to meet those needs. Program planning includes a heavy emphasis on non-traditional education offerings, since most of the traditional education has been purchased. An Open Learning Center, media supported instruction, home study courses, high school escrow programs, public library programs and experiential learning activities have already been implemented or are in the planning stages.

Thirdly, student program flexibility is enhanced as the student can "tailor make" a program through several institutions or off-campus programs. The common market concept has been designed to bring educational services closer to the people, shortening the traveling distances and recognizing the time parameters of the predominately rural, agriculturally-based clientele. This approach is apparently working as evidenced by the fact that over fifty percent of the students exceed the age of twenty-six.

A fourth advantage to the common market concept is that the expanded programs and services encourage young students to stay in the area. Why leave the district to attend a private or public residential college when the opportunity is available locally, at reduced tuition rates? Over a period of time the new concept may change the outward migration pattern of the typical rural community.

There are many other distinct advantages to the contractual common market, but time and space prevent a full disclosure. Ultimately, however, the success or failure will hinge on two factors: quality of programs and cost per unit of instruction. Quality will be judged over a period of time and measured by the success of the graduates. Cost factors, however, are more readily discernible. Preliminary unit cost figures have encouraged the JWCC Board and Staff to be cautiously optimistic. Second year enrollment increases should decrease the per unit cost because of the variable bulk rate payment schedule to common market schools. Direct instructional costs are easily identified. Not so easy is the task of measuring savings on buildings that have not been built, equipment that is being shared, and man hours that are saved in purchasing ready made programs.

Challenges for the Common Market Concept

There are potential problem areas with this fresh approach to delivering educational services. Among these are:

Can the common market colleges respond quickly to the changing patterns of student enrolmment and increasing demands of programs and facilities?

Will the expanded community college enrollment have a negative impact on the philosophical base of the institutional identity, and, if so, will the dual involvement create a conflict which affects the instructional programs?

Will the mechanics of admission, registration, drop and adds, withdrawals, program changes and audit trails, restrict and discourage cooperation among institutions?

Can a public institution avoid the criticism and potential judicial review dealing with the separation of church and state in working with church related colleges?

Will the State of Illinois recognize the uniqueness of the common market concept and be flexible enough to respond with differing funding patterns to offset built-in contractual costs for capital expenditures and equipment?

Will the Board of Trustees and professional staff be able to resist the desire to build a monument, or develop an athletic program?

Will various accrediting agencies continue to approve the concept and accept the evaluation techniques that are under consideration?

These and other challenges face the Board and Staff of JWCC. Hopefully, the challenges will be accepted and solutions will be found to permit the residents of District 539 the opportunity to complete educational objectives in a most unusual fashion.

"Case Study #3: The 'Contract College' Type: Union County Coordinating Agency for Higher Education

by

Richard Lucas
Executive Director, Union County Coordinating Agency for Higher Education

The Union County Coordinating Agency for Higher Education provides the means by which Union County in New Jersey makes immediate and extensive use of two existing educational institutions, Union College (in Cranford) and Union County Technical Institute (in Scotch Plains), to secure for the residents of the county the services and facilities of a community college. This undertaking in Union County is significant for two main reasons:

(1) It provides an example of two ongoing institutions in consortium to do the work of a community college (one specializing in technical and career programs, the other in academic courses); and

(2) It provides tangible evidence of a "private" college involved in providing community college services and so designated both by statute and in practice.

History

Union College was started as the first (and very experimental federally financed two-year college under the Works Progress Administration in 1933. Serving the location in the absence of any community college legislation in New Jersey for many years, the college acquired strong local citizen support. It was organized as an independent two-year institution, dependent mostly upon student tuition. So Union Junior College (later Union College) was continuing in the 1960s, when community college legislation came to New Jersey.

Meanwhile, in 1959 the public Union County Technical Institute had been founded under provisions of a New Jersey law providing for high school and post-high school vocational and technical training. Inasmuch as the Union College programs had developed mainly as academic and transfer courses at the collegiate level, the appearance of the technical institute supplemented the services of the college. A degree of cooperation developed, and leading citizens assisted and advised both schools. The presidents of the two institutions met often and worked closely together. Both served on a special committee appointed to look into the needs in higher education in the country. By this time it was evident that both schools were providing many of the services of a community college.

As the proposed legislation for a state system of two-year colleges came before the legislature, assemblymen and the state senator from Union County (all of whom had been well informed of the ongoing resources the county enjoyed in having Union College and Union County Technical Institute) sponsored successfully a rider to the state community college law enabling the county to contract for two-year-college services. This was followed up with legislation in 1969 establishing the Union County Coordinating

Agency for Higher Education, with its own local nine-member board. Appointments are made by the county board of freeholders. The passage of the enabling legislation and its implementation through appropriation and endorsement at the county level (in New Jersey State and county are about equally responsible for financial support of community colleges) were notably achieved through full bipartisan support. The proposal was at no time a political issue.

Perhaps one means of measuring properly the significance of this particular experiment in cooperation and the focus surrounding it is to consider the alternative. In those years when the Union County plan was being ratified, many other New Jersey counties were embarking upon new community colleges. The capital costs alone ranged from six to twenty-five million dllars. It is estimated that for a county the size of Union County the initial capital costs would have been at least $10 million and would have reached $20 million quickly in a necessary second stage of development. Moreover, new colleges had to assemble administrators and staffs and faculty, purchase equipment, build libraries, assemble programs, and do a host of other things before even opening their doors. Beyond this, they would have to wait several years to demonstrate their entitlement to regional accreditation. All this Union County had going for it right from the start.

The Arrangement

The Agency, established in 1969 and functioning ever since then, is charged with the duty of determining the needs of the county with respect to public higher education on the level of the first two years of education beyond high school; and it is also charged with determining to what extent existing institutions located in the county shall be utilized to meet such needs in whole or in part, and for planning for the future development of the institutions. It coordinates the operations and facilities of the two institutions for the maximum service of the citizens of Union County; collects state and county education allocations; and, in accordance with contractual arrangements made with each institution, reimburses these institutions for services rendered. This is done in accordance with the provisions of Chapter 180, Laws of 1968 of New Jersey, a special act providing for the establishment of such an agency in a county desiring to avail itself of existing independent two-year-college facilities. In 1969, contracts were drawn up and signed between the agency and the college, between the agency and the institute, and between the college and the institute. This triangulation of agreements enables the agency to procure educational services from the two institutions and to compensate for the rendering of such services in accordance with county budgetary provisions and with the approval of the chancellor and the state board of higher education. It also enables the two institutions, through their own contract, to offer special programs by which students on one campus may take courses on the other; and it specifically provides that Union County Technical Institute students in approved college-level programs will receive the Associate in Applied Sciences degree bestowed by Union College by authority of the state board of higher education. These articles of agreement were approved by the chancellor and the state board of higher education in 1969 and went into immediate effect. This marked a milestone in New Jersey education for the utilization of resources, both independent and public, cooperating together to widen educational opportunity and avoiding costly and inefficient duplication of programs and facilities. The relationship is not managerial. It is supervisory, advisory, and visitorial.

Each institution has the opportunity to shape creatively its own character and role. At the same time, through the agency the two institutions coordinate their programs and facilities as much as possible with each other for the welfare of the entire county.

Each institution has its own distinctive educational offerings. The programs at Union County Technical Institute are primarily technical and business courses, health related courses, programs for two years or less, designed to meet the many-faceted needs of business, industry, governemtn agencies, and the professional and semi-professional demands of the county. Union College, developing in a tradition of close cooperation with four-year colleges and universities dating back to its founding in 1933, has emphasized curricula in the liberal arts, science, engineering, and business administration. The offerings in evening, special, and continuing education are offered on both campuses.

In accordance with the arrangement provided for by statute and in the contracts with Union College and Union County Technical Institute, the agency receives monies from the state and the county and then, in turn, forwards payments to both institutions for proportionate services rendered.

For purposes of funding at the state level, the agency is treated in the same manner as other community colleges in the state, that is, state funds are allocated on an FTE basis. At the county level, the agency submits its budget to the county department of finance for review, inclusion and approval in the county budget process.

The importance of the Union County innovation in higher education in providing direct and sharp lines of communication may well turn out to be one of its most influential contributions. Through regularly scheduled meetings, systematic reports, constant contact, and recurrent review, the agency and cooperating institutions together exert a systematic effort not only to respond to the needs of the county but to improve and make more effective the existing programs and offerings. The agency, moreover, by positive teamwork with the two institutions, can provide a continuing evaluation of the scope and effectiveness of the offerings of both. The agency also is responsible for keeping the freeholders and other county officials informed of important developments in the field of higher education. Through frequent distribution of reports and a newsletter, the agency provides concise and regular information to freeholders and others.

Observations

The system has continued to grow and we have been able to cope with that growth despite declining state funding and a constant level of county funding. Today, there are approximately 6300 FTE's in the Union County System, and an approximate head count of 20,000 students. The county has the fifth lowest FTE cost in the state. The range of program offerings is among the broadest in the state, and we are the leaders in allied health programs and health care facilities. In addition, we have subcontracted, through Union College, with several existing hospital programs in the county to broaden our offerings.

Until very recent times, the Agency has operated free of political interference.

While the arrangement has had a number of accomplishments, it has had its share of problems also.

When the arrangement was conceived, it was anticipated that the institutions would be tied together much more closely. This has not happened for a number of reasons and, as a result, other problems have developed.

Structure of the Agency

The Agency was designed as a weak agency. All managerial powers are left to the institutions. The contracts between the agency and the institutions are vague, and contain a provision for automatic renewal. The previous executive director of the Agency was a part-time employee. The Agency currently has only one staff person. The board of the Agency is comprised of two representatives from each institution, four members from the public-at-large, and the county superintendent of schools. Up until last May, the board met only five times a year. In addition, the institutional representatives were the dominant personalities on the board. In short, the agency has followed the path of other public regulatory agencies; it has tended to become the captive of the firms (institutions) that ostensibly they regulate.

Competitive Institutions

With accountability defined in only the most general terms, and agency oversight by committee, institutional cooperation gave way to competition. As a result, the Agency found itself funding duplicate functions and services as each institution sought to build its empire.

Middle States Association

The Commission on Higher Education of the Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools is a voluntary accrediting agency that accredits institutions according to certain criteria that encourage institutional excellence. Since their two-year follow-up visit, the Association has expressed its concern about the contractual relationships between Union College and Union County Technical Institute. A letter from the Association in July, 1976, stated:

> "The Commission expressed its continuing concern with the viability of Union College's relationship with Union County Technical Institute as a long-term arrangement and requested information and/or documentation by April 1, 1977 on (1) the type and degree of control which the College exerts over the programs of UCTI leading to the Associate degree and (2) any developments or changes in the structure or organization of the coordinating agency."

The Middle States' "Interim Guidelines on Contractual Relationships With Non-regionally Accredited Organizations" are clear regarding control of course offerings, faculty, student records, and student services. The Guidelines also treat of the contract, enrollment agreement, tuition policies, and student recruitment. As of this date, the College exercises little or no control over these functions as they relate to Union County Technical Institute.

Chancellor of Higher Education

The Chancellor, in a recent memorandum concerning the role of the Agency, could see little progress in clarifying the role of the Agency. His memorandum made six specific requests and ended with the threat:

> "If evidence of progress toward true coordination under the present statute is not forthcoming according to the above requirements, I will request that the Board of Higher Education reassess its recommendation for state assistance to such an agreement."

The Chancellor expressed fear that "The Agency has never been able to escape the dominance of institutional interests and, whether consciously or not, the institutions have tended to manipulate the Agency so that it would seldom if ever seriously consider or take an action which was not acceptable to the institutions."

Department of Education vs. Department of Higher Education

There is a conflict at the state level between these departments. Union County Technical Institute is chartered as an institution of secondary education, not an institution of higher education. As a result, the Department of Education has raised the question of licensure or certification for faculty teaching at the Institute. In addition, the funding of various facilities and programs has been questioned, since the institution also functions as the County Vocational School.

The Future

A combination of economies and pressures from Middle States, from the Chancellor of Higher Education, and the licensure question requires a "bite the bullet" approach now on the part of the Coordinating Agency. The thesis that I offer here is that attempts to deal with significant integration of the institutions have failed precisely because there has been a reluctance to confront the real issue -- the question of institutional relationships within the system.

The Agency must not appear unwilling to excercise its power The two county educational institutions depend on the Agency for a substantial part of their operating budgets. That fact gives the Agency great clout which it should use.

The enabling legislation provides that the contract "shall provide that expenditures...shall be made under the supervision of the agency and exclusively for the purposes and program approved by it." The agency has a defined role in the preparation of the annual budget of the two institutions. In addition, the agency has approval over new academic programs.

Regarding the composition of the board, the Agency currently has a bill in the legislature to increase the public representation on the Agency board by two members.

At the staff level, the agency has committed itself and budgeted for additional staff members by July 1st.

The Agency staff would have the responsibility and capacity to monitor the academic programming and research and the needs of the county, to design and implement an agency public and legislature relations program, and to monitor both budget preparation and expenditure including resource development from private as well as governmental sources.

The agency is rectifying the contractual relationship with each institution. Notice has been served to each institution that the current contracts will be terminated as of June 30 and a new contract offered for their consideration. While the exact method of implementation has not been determined, one possible scenario is that the Agency should have one contract - with Union College - to provide the programs and services of a comprehensive community college for the residents of Union County. The College, as prime contractor, could then sub-contract with the Institute, hospitals, or any other appropriate agency in order to meet the requirements of its contract with the Agency.

In addition, all operational functions should be centralized at the College under such a contract. This in essence places total responsibility, authority, and control for the educational program on Union College by the Agency and should provide the impetus for greater articulation and involvement for technical education programs.

The argument for such an arrangement is as extensive as it is obvious. The Agency's role become defined, finally, as "coordinating," accountability lines are established much more clearly; all students are enrolled at Union College and legitimate Middle States concerns about degree granting are eliminated; some economies not possible under the present contractual arrangements can be insisted upon by the Agency and effected by the College; and finally, the Agency's use of power and the generation and implementation of a Master Plan for Union County respond to the Chancellor's concerns about the effectiveness of the Agency.

I trust you find this brief overview of the unique arrangement in Union County of value. Based on this experience, I would urge those of you involved in similar arrangements to recheck compliance with your regional accrediting authorities, and ask what mechanisms are provided in the arrangement to assure accountability of public funds.

I wish to thank Dr. Kenneth C. MacKay, Former Executive Director of the Agency, for his assistance in preparing parts of this paper.

SECTION IV

THE STATE-FEDERAL EXCHANGE

The new legislation requires rule-making (guidelines) on the part of federal officials, then submissions (plans) on the part of the states. The Orlando conference took place one month after the Carter administration had come into office, the new enactment in hand but the guidelines not yet written (the latter appeared in April). In this in-between stage, then, state officials sought to influence federal thinking during the formative stages of rule-making, and, of course, to pick up clues about potential policies and funding levels.

Five program heads from the United States Office of Education were interviewed in plenary session. Parts of what they had to day -- descriptions of the act and of draft versions of guidelines -- is reflected in other papers in this volume or is now a matter of public record. Larger concerns were voiced, however, and are here recorded.

Paul Delker, for example, head of OE's adult basic education division, saw Title I's Part B as a congressionally mandated opportunity to conceptualize the character of lifelong learning opportunities desired in this country; to him, the Part B statement must become the direction-setter for OE categorical programs. Two issues were foreseen as arising. One, will the focus be on adults and their learning needs or on institutions and their needs for new markets for formal eduction? And two, should new government expenditure for adult learners encompass all adults or concentrate on the financially needy? These issues, he warned, will arise shortly in state planning, but next year at the federal level, too, as the Adult Education Act expires and comes up for review.

To David Johnson, Director of the Division of Student Services and preparer of guidelines for the education information centers, key issues in developing these centers will be the quality and community-rootedness of services offered. The key to quality, in his view, is that services such as assessment, advisement, and referral be individual and well informed. Information systems "that put meat in the advising" will be needed. "My concern is that computers will counsel and counselors will store information in their heads," he added. Secondly, Johnson wants assurances that minorities and the underserved, including rural residents, are reached by new information services, and hopes to see such constituencies involved at the community level in the development of state plans.

This latter set of concerns was seconded by James Ormiston of OE's community college unit. New Title X language, he pointed out, directs attention to needs of underserved populations and requires responsiveness to such needs as a condition for federal support. Eugene Weldon, OE Chief of Community Services and Continuing Education with responsibility for Part A of Title I, agreed with these notions but called upon states to broaden the sweep of their master planning to encompass wider sets of objectives related to adult learning needs. Local planning, especially if institution-based, tends to short-shift larger societal and adult-population needs; collections of local plans, or of state plans for federal categorical programs, do not add up to the larger conception needed to make lifelong learning a fact.

Several state representatives, while agreeing in principle, rejoined that it was time the pieces were together at the federal level. A state today, it was said, must file 35-40 separate categorical plans, at different times over the course of the year and under quite disparate sets of regulations. The fault may be in the legislation rather than with OE, observers noted, but a key barrier to coordinated state policies for lifelong learning is the fact of "terrible fragmentation" at the federal level. In a telling aside, OE's "community services" and "student services" branch heads, both 10-year agency veterans, admitted they had never had a conversation with one another until the previous night (in Orlando). Dick Millard of the Education Commission of the States summed up considerable conferee feeling when he advised the federal officials to "work together, improve planning and coordination at your level, and you'll get better results at the state level."

To the latter end, a number of state and federal people voiced the hope that state 1202 commissions (or "postsecondary education commissions," as Welden hoped they would soon start to be called) might now with new federal funding begin to provide the kind of coordinated, overall leadership some feel has been absent at the state level. A suggestion was made that these commissions could be specially valuable in linking formal educational endeavor with interests of labor, community organizations employers, and the like, both for the sake of building a climate for lifelong learning programs and for enhanced public support for the concept.

APPENDIX A

THE CONFERENCE PROGRAM

State Planning for Lifelong Learning:
Improving Access for All Citizens

Howard Johnson's Executive
Center Downtown

304 West Colonial Drive
Orlando, Florida 32803

February 20-22, 1977
Final Agenda

SUNDAY, FEBRUARY 20

2:00 p.m. . . . . .Conference Registration begins

4:00 p.m. . . . . .State Resources Fair begins

Representatives from each state are invited to bring multiple copies of state studies, descriptions of demonstration projects, brochures and announcements of state programs related to lifelong learning. These materials will be displayed throughout the conference at "state desks" in the main conference room. Where possible, please bring 150 copies. A great way to share what's going on in your state with your colleagues in other states.

5:00 p.m. . . . . .Conference Welcome

Dr. Roger Nichols, Deputy Commissioner
Florida Department of Education

5:15 p.m. . . . . .Conference Objectives and Announcements

Dr. Charles Reed, Executive Director
Florida Postsecondary Education Commission

5:30-6:30 p.m. . . . . Conference Teams Meet

Each conferee will be assigned to a team which will include officials from a variety of states representing a diversity of functions. During this time members will get acquainted and share conference hopes and discuss conference objectives.

6:30 p.m. . . . . .Dinner

Conferees will have dinner in the conference hotel with team members

8:30 p.m. . . . . Social

An unstructured social activity is being organized for interested participants.

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 21

8:30-8:40 a.m. . . . . Organization Session

Dr. Charles Reed, Executive Director
Florida Postsecondary Education Commission

8:40-10:00 a.m. . . . . State Planning for Adult Learners

A session chaired by Dr. John Folger, of the Education Commission of the States, which will attempt to provide a comprehensive perspective on statewide planning for adult learners. Dr. Folger will interview a panel of state officials representing different states and different planning perspectives. The panel participants will be:

Dr. Donald R. McNeil, Executive Director, California Postsecondary Education Commission

Dr. Peter Smith, President, Vermont Community College

Dr. Nelson Swinerton, Senior Staff Associate, The University of Wisconsin System

Dr. Norman D. Kurland, Director, Study of Adult Education, New York State Education Department

10:00-10:15 a.m. . . . . Break

10:15-10:45 a.m. . . . . Education Amendments of 1976

Dr. Aimes McGuinness, Coordinator of Federal Relations for the Education Commission of the States, will lead a discussion of the impact of the recently passed Amendments on state planning for adult learners.

10:45 a.m. -
12:15 p.m. . . . . **Recent Federal Developments**

Two consecutive sessions on recent federal activities:

A. Update on the H.E.W. Lifelong Learning Project — A session on the implementation of the "Mondale Bill on Lifelong Learning (Title I, Part B). *Dr. Virginia Smith, Director of the H.E.W. Lifelong Learning Project*

B. Conversation with U.S.O.E. Program Staff on Comprehensive State Planning and the Education Amendments of 1976

Interviewer: *Kenneth Fischer, Director, Postsecondary Education Convening Authority*

Interviewees: *Paul Delker, Director, Division of Adult Education*

Charles Griffith, Director, State Planning Commission's Program

David Johnson, Director, Division of Student Services and Veterans Programs

James Ormiston, Assistant Director, Community College Unit

Eugene Welden, Chief, Community Services and Continuing Education Branch

12:15-1:30 p.m. . . . . **Lunch (with teams)**

1:30-4:30 p.m. . . . . **Workshop Modules: Part I**

Conferees will attend one of two concurrently offered workshop modules depending on their personal interests and responsibilities:

A. Non-traditional Postsecondary Education Delivery Systems — a discussion of state planning issues associated with these new delivery systems (regional consortia, "paper community colleges," external degree programs, [illegible].).

1. Moderator: *Dr. Joseph Olander, Special Assistant to the Commissioner, Postsecondary Education, Florida Department of Education*

Presentor: *Dr. S.V. Martorana, Director, Center for the Study of Higher Education, The Pennsylvania State University*

2. Moderator: *Representative Elaine Bloom, Florida House of Representatives/ Florida Postsecondary Education Commission*

Presentor: *Dr. Louis Bender, Director, State and Regional Higher Education Center, The Florida State University*

B. Educational Brokering — explore with students and practitioners how educational brokering services (information, advisement, referral, assessment, and advocacy for adult learners) can facilitate the selection and use of educational experiences by adults. Dr. Francis Macy, Director, The National Center for Educational Brokering, will coordinate this session.

1. What are the re-entry problems of adult students?

Interview with students

2. How do information and counseling services respond to the adult's problems?

Interview with practitioners

5:00 p.m. . . . . Reception

6:00-7:00 p.m. . . . . Dinner

Conferees will have dinner in the conference hotel with team members

7:30-9:30 p.m. . . . . Workshop Modules: Part II

Conferees will attend the second part of the workshop module they selected during the afternoon.

A. Non-traditional Postsecondary Delivery Systems -- this session will conclude with a panel discussion between four different state representatives who will describe the delivery systems being initiated in their states. Conferee participation in the dialogue will be encouraged.

Moderator: *Thomas Furlong, Associate for Program Policy Analysis, Florida Department of Education*

Panelists: *Wilbur Wakefield, Coordinator, Minnesota Regional Postsecondary Education Center*

Paul R. Heath, President, John Wood Community College in Illinois

Richard Lucas, Union County Coordinating Agency, New Jersey

Peter Smith, President, Vermont Community College, Montpelier, Vermont

B. Educational Brokering -- Dr. Macy will coordinate the concluding portion of this module.

1. Where are adult information and counseling services and how are they financed?

   Identification by state representatives

2. What is the federal Education Information Center Program?

   Discussion with David Johnson, Administrator of the program at U.S.O.E., and Director, Division of Student Services and Veterans Programs

3. How can states plan educational information and counseling services?

   Small group brainstorming by conferees

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 22

9:00-9:20. . . . . .Federal/State Relations

Moderator: *Dr. Jack Tebo, Associate for Policy Analysis*

Presentor: *Dr. Richard Millard, Director, Higher Education Services, Education Commission of the States*

9:20-10:30 a.m. . . . . Program Participants Resource Fair

Here's a chance to meet with the conference speakers and panelists you didn't have a chance to speak with during the previous two days. Each will have his or her own "territory" in the main conference room. Ask them about new grant programs, the status of federal regulations, or follow-up on points they made during earlier sessions.

10:45 a.m. -
12:30 p.m. . . . . .Final Sessions with Teams

An opportunity to clarify what happened at the conference, review conference objectives, and pull together the teams' thoughts on the meeting. Each team will undertake a task to assist in this process.

Mr. Kenneth Fischer, Director,
Postsecondary Education Convening
Authority

12:30-1:00 p.m. . . . . Check Out

1:00-2:00 p.m. . . . . .Luncheon and Conference Wrap-Up

This final conference session will include presentations by Dr. Warren Hill, Director of the Education Commission of the States, and Mr. Theodore Marchese, Conference Synthesizer and Director of Institutional Research at Barat College. Dr. Louis Rabineau, Director, In-service Education Project (IEP), Education Commission of the States, will provide conference closing remarks and announcements.

NOTE: The conference sponsors gratefully acknoledge the support and assistance provided by the staff of Valencia Community College during this meeting.

APPENDIX B

The Conference Participants

Name	Area of Responsibility - Reasons for Attending
Kathleen Andersen Research Assistant Board of Regents Suite 1530 One American Place Baton Rouge, LA 70804	Planning and research, development of master plan for non-traditional education.
William Arceneaux Commissioner of Higher Education Board of Regents P.O. Box 33362 Baton Rouge, LA 70804 (504) 389-5206	
Keith H. Asplin Director for Academic Affairs Colorado Commission on Higher Education 1550 Lincoln St., R-210 Denver, CO 80220 (303) 892-2723	Program review and approval, student assistance and adult continuing education programs. Want to expand understanding of issues related to policy development at state level in areas of adult education.
Joseph F. Bard, Director Lifelong Learning Pennsylvania Department of Education Box 911 Harrisburg, PA 17126 (717) 783-8228	Director of office staff; development and implementation of lifelong learning opportunities in Pennsylvania. Want to improve understanding of what is happening regarding Higher Education Amendments.
Charles M. Barrett Associate Vice President for Educational Programs North Carolina Dept. of Community College 170 Education Building Raleigh, NC 27611 (919) 733-7057	Administration of continuing education and non-degree programs. Representing the North Carolina Department of Community Colleges in the area of continuing education and representing the North Carolina Advisory Council for Title I.

Name	Area of Responsibility - Reasons for Attending
Louis W. Bender, Dir. State and Regional Higher Education Center The Florida State University Tallahassee, FL 32306 (904) 644-6024	Conference planner
Sidney Besvinick, Dean Academic Administration and Planning University of Miami P.O. Box 248033 Coral Gables, FL 33124 (305) 284-3356	Planning and administration at University of Miami. Member of the Florida Postsecondary Education Commission.
Myron R. Blee, Bureau Chief Program Support and Services Community College Division Florida Department of Education Tallahassee, FL 32304 (904) 488-0555	Program support and services
Barbara Bloom, Coordinator Regional Continuing Education for Women Program Temple University Philadelphia, PA 19122	Panelist
Suzanne Boles Tulsa City County Library System Tulsa, OK 73101	Panelist
William Bowden Coordinator, Manpower Improvement Project Southern Association of Colleges and Schools 795 Peachtree Street, N.E. Atlanta, GA 30308 (404) 875-8011	Development of interstate and intrastate systems of cooperation in postsecondary and continuing education. Interested in implication of Education Amendments of 1976, Mondale Lifelong Learning Amendment, and in patterns of cooperation between postsecondary education and private enterprise.
Joe Brindley Assistant Director Junior College Section State Department of Education Montgomery, AL 36130	Administration of the Junior College Branch. Want to gain knowledge regarding statewide planning for implementation of lifelong learning.

Name	Area of Responsibility - Reason for Attending
Archie I. Buffkins, Asst. Dean for Grad. Studies University of Maryland College Park, Maryland 20742 (301) 454-4749	Higher education in terms of employment and adult education in relationship to the National Advisory Council on Adult Education. Serving as representative of the National Advisory Council on Adult Education.
Donald Butcher, Dean School of General Education Ferris State College Big Rapids, MI 48307 (616) 796-9366	Chairman of Program Planning Committee of the National Council of Adult Education. Attending to determine ways in which the National Council can assist states in coordinating lifelong learning activities.
Apolinario Castro Assistant Secretary of Education Department of Education St. Cesar Gonzalez, Esq. Calaff Hato Rey, Puerto Rico 00919 (809) 766-4011	Adult and community education. Interest in improving adult and community education (statewide) in Puerto Rico.
Martha Chang, Educational Social Research Specialist Florida Department of Education Knott Building Tallahassee, FL 32304 (904) 487-1630	Educational research
Newton O. Cattell, Director Federal Programs Pennsylvania State University 304 Old Main University Park, PA 16802 (814) 865-9501	Federal relations for the Universities.
S.F. Charles, Executive Director Regional Community Colleges Board of Trustees 1280 Asylum Avenue Hartford, CN 06107 (203) 232-4817	Chief executive officer for the State System of Community Colleges. Experimenting with several off-campus learning programs including a state-wide set of public t.v. courses.

Name	Area of Responsibility - Reason for Attending
Pamela Christoffel College Board Washington, D.C. 20013	
Phillip W. Conn, Director Legislative Research Committee Room 300 State Capitol Frankfort, KY 40601 (502) 564-3126	Supervise all legislative staff activities, including bill drafting, research and services to committees. Gain additional insight into various educational programs designed for adults.
Larry C. Coppard Special Assistant to the Dean School of Education University of Michigan Ann Arbor, MI 48109 (313) 763-0078	Conducting study of graduate institutions in Michigan regarding feasibility of establishing external graduate degree programs. The study is funded by Carnegie Corporation of New York and should be completed by June, 1977. Want to find out what other states are doing in planning for adult students.
William B. Coulter Vice Chancellor for Administration Ohio Board of Regents 30 East Broad Street 36th Floor Columbus, OH 43215 (614) 466-6000	Supervisor of the Division of Financial Administration and the Division of Management Information. Interested in educational services to adult students beyond the usual college age.
Mr. James L. Davis Deputy Assistant Regional Commissioner Postsecondary Education U.S. Office of Education 50 7th Street Atlanta, GA 30323	Programs associated with the Division of Postsecondary Education. To gain information from agencies and institutions on lifelong learning.
Paul Delker, Director of Adult Education U.S. Office of Education Washington, D.C. 20202	Panelist

Name	Area of Responsibility - Reason for Attending
Beatrice Ettinger, Dir. Continuing Education for Women Valencia Community College P.O. Box 3028 Orlando, FL 32802 (305) 299-5000	Continuing Education for Women -- developing programs, operating an assessment center. Interested in the lifelong learning concept and in educational brokering.
Daniel Ferber, Chairman Minnesota Learning Society 1568 Summit Avenue St. Paul, MN 55105 (612) 698-6318	
Kenneth Fischer, Dir. Postsecondary Education Convening Authority Institute for Educational Leadership 1001 Connecticut Avenue, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20036 (202) 833-2745	Conference Planner
John Folger, Project Dir. Evaluation of Statewide Planning in Postsecondary Education Education Commission of the States 1860 Lincoln Street, Suite 300 Denver, CO 80203 (303) 893-5200	Conference Planner
C. Wayne Freeberg, Ex. Dir. State Board of Independent Colleges and Universitie- Florida Department of Educ. Knott Building Tallahassee, FL 32304 (904) 488-8695	Florida Independent Colleges and Universities. The SBICU has considered applications by numbers of institutions with non-traditional delivery systems, brokering services and contractual services. Wish to learn more about assessing the quality of institutions, branch locations, and programs as well as state planning issues.
Ted B. Freeman, Branch Chief, Adult Education U.S. Office of Education 50-7th Street, N.E., Rm 555 Atlanta, GA 30323 (404) 881-4311	Adult and continuing education. Present to represent the Regional Commissioner of Education - Region IV.

Name	Area of Responsibility - Reason for Attending
Thomas Furlong, Assoc. for Program Policy Analysis Department of Education Knott Building Tallahassee, FL 32304 (904) 488-1812	Policy analysis. Conference planner.
James Furman, Exec. Dir. Board of Higher Education 119 South 5th Street Springfield, IL 62705 (217) 782-2551	Director of agency. Gain an overall perspective about issues and problems relative to state-wide planning.
Daniel Gardner Adult Education Research Assistant College of Education Florida Atlantic University Boca Raton, FL 33431 (304) 395-5100, ext. 2825	
Russell (Rusty) Garth Program Officer Fund for Improvement of Postsecondary Education 400 Maryland Avenue, S.W. Washington, D.C. 20202 (202) 245-8906	Representative of Dr. Virginia Smith
Philip D. Goldhagen Director of Special Projects Department of Education 347 Miles Johnson Building Tallahassee, FL 32304 (904) 488-8883	Legislation; gain understanding of the possibilities and approaches that may be involved in proposals to the Florida Legislature.
Charles I. Griffith, Dir. State Planning Commission Program, Bureau of Postsecondary Education U.S. Office of Education 400 Maryland Avenue, S.W. Washington, D.C. 20202 (202) 245-2671	Statewide planning to postsecondary education. Conference planner.

Name	Area of Responsibility - Reason for Attending
Gwen Gurley, Project Secretary Education Commission of the States 1860 Lincoln Street, Suite 300 Denver, CO 80295 (303) 893-5200	Conference support
E. Raymond Hackett, Research Assistant Strategy Planning and MIS Department of Education Knott Building Tallahassee, FL 32304 (904) 487-1630	Collecting and analyzing data with regard to social factors that affect education and its coordination at the state level. Interest in state level planning and coordination of postsecondary education.
William T. Hanna Budget Analyst Florida Department of Education Knott Building Tallahassee, FL 32304 (904) 488-1812	Postsecondary education planning and budgeting process.
O.W. Tad Hascall ACT P.O. Box 168 Iowa City, IA 52240	College level placement examinations
Paul Heath, President John Wood Community College 1919 North 18th Street Quincy, IL 62301	Panelist
James Heffernan Professor of Higher Education Syracuse University Syracuse, NY 13210	Panelist
Brenda J. Helton Higher Education Specialist Council on Public Higher Educ. Eighth Floor-Capitol Plaza Frankfort, KY 40601 (502) 564-5483	Planning; interested in educational brokering arrangements.

Name	Areas of Responsibility - Reason for Attending
Lee Henderson, Dir. Division of Community Colleges Florida Dept. of Education 107 W. Gaines Street Tallahassee, FL 32304 (904) 488-1721	State Community College Director
Charles J. Henson Assistant Office of Planning, Budgeting and Evaluation Department of Education Knott Building Tallahassee, FL 32304 (904) 488-1812	Special programs with the Post-Secondary Education Unit. To gain information on planning for life-long learning activities, and on Education Amendments of 1976.
Warren Hill, Director Education Commission of the States 1860 Lincoln Street 300 Lincoln Tower Denver, CO 80203 (303) 893-5200	Conference speaker.
James J. Hollowood, Student Harvard University 31 Springfield Belmont, MS 02178 (617) 495-3512	Statewide management of post-secondary education. New responsibilities for statewide coordination/governance. To learn more about non-traditional education.
Susan S. Hreha Office of Planning, Budgeting and Evaluation Postsecondary Education Unit Department of Education Knott Building Tallahassee, FL 32304 (904) 488-1812	Conference support.
Wilbur W. Hurt, Dir. Community Services Co-ordinating Board Texas College and Univ. System Box 12788, Cap. Station Austin, TX 78711 (512) 475-3413	Administering Title I state planning for adult and continuing education. To gain insights useful to planning for Title I-B.

Name	Areas of Responsibility - Reason for Attending
Roy J. Ingham, Assoc. Professor Florida State University Adult Education 118 North Woodward Tallahassee, FL 32306 (904) 644-1568	Teaching, design methodology. To learn, gain information for sharing with colleagues and students in graduate programs at Florida State University.
E.R. Jobe, Chairman Postsecondary Education Planning Council 1855 Eastover Drive Suite 116 University Center Jackson, MS 39211 (601) 982-6730	Chairman of the Mississippi Postsecondary Education Planning Board
David Johnson, Director Division of Student Services and Veterans Programs U.S.Office of Education Washington, D.C. 20202	Panelist
Richard W. Jonsen Project Director Education Commission of the States 1860 Lincoln St., Suite 300 Denver, CO 80203 (303) 893-5200	Project director for task force on Independent Higher Education and State policy. To gain more information on lifelong learning.
Howard Jordan, Jr. Vice Chancellor for Services Board or Regents University System of Ga. 244 Washington St., S.W. Atlanta, GA 30334 (404) 656-2256	Coordinator of Public Service/ Continuing Education activities for 32 institutions of the University System of Georgia. Vital concern with lifelong learning.
Joe Kaplan, Assistant Department of Education Knott Building Tallahassee, FL 32304 (904) 487-1009	
Donna Knight Minnesota State Planning Agency 101 Capitol Square Building St. Paul, MN 55101 (612) 296-4852	Policy resource and systems design. Resource person to discuss findings of recent report, "Alternatives for Lifelong Learning in Minnesota: The Non-Formal Educational Sector"

Name	Areas of Responsibility - Reason for Attending
Martin P. Knowlton National Director Elderhostel 15 Larrison Road Durham, NH 03824 (603) 862-2055	
E.C. Kormanyos Associate Dean for Academic Administration Walden University Naples, FL 33940	Academic administration
Norman Kurland, Dir. Study of Adult Education New York State Education Department Room 232 EB Washington Ave. Albany, NW 12234 (518) 474-5972	Involved in policy studies in adult education for State Education Department. Also on staff of the Lifelong Learning Project for HEW. To learn about planning procedures and outcomes in other states and to learn about Federal plans for lifelong learning.
David B. Laird, Jr. Assistant Executive Dir. for Inter-Institutional Program Planning Minnesota Higher Education Coordination Board 400 Capitol Square Building 550 Cedar Street St. Paul, MN 55101 (612) 296-3974	Regional inter-institutional planning and continuing education. To review developments in other states and consult on federal rule making.
Dale Lake 304 Arundel Beach Road Severna Park, MD 21146 (301) 647-9530	
Bob Law, Assistant Director Professional Development and Public Service Florida State University 319 Hecht House Tallahassee, FL 32306 (904) 644-3801	Program development; continuing education for public employees.

Name	Area of Responsibility - Reason for Attending
Robert J. Leonard Executive Director Georgia Postsecondary Education Commission 2970 Peachtree Road, N.W. Suite 620 Atlanta, GA 30305 (404) 233-5449	Postsecondary education. I am interested in planning for lifelong learning, and in the Education Amendments of 1976.
Jerome E. Lord, Chief Open Learning Systems Branch Department of Health, Education and Welfare National Institute of Education Washington, D.C. 20208 (202) 254-6050	Open Learning Systems. To learn more about state plans and problems so that a better job can be done at the Federal level.
Richard Lucas Union County Coordinating Agency Union County, New Jersey	Panelist
Aims McGuinness Education Commission of the States 1860 Lincoln Street 300 Lincoln Tower Denver, CO 80203 (303) 893-5200	Conference planner.
Gail T. McClure, Planning Coordinator Higher Education Facilities Commission State of Iowa C 303 East Hall The University of Iowa Iowa City, IA 52242 (319) 353-5288	Planning coordinator for state projects. To gain information on planning for lifelong learners and adults in the State.
Donald R. McNeil, Director California Postsecondary Educ. Commission 1020 12th Street Sacramento, CA 95814 (916) 445-1000	Panelist on comprehensive perspective on statewide planning.

Name	Areas of Responsibility - Reasons for Attending
Marilyn McQuain Community Service Supervisor Orange Co. Florida Public Schools 410 Woods Avenue Orlando, FL 32805 (305) 422-8151	Educational programs for older persons and community instructional services
Francis Macy, Director National Center for Educational Brokering 405 Oak Street Syracuse, NY 13202 (315) 425-5275	Conference planner
Theodore Marchese Director of Institutional Research Barat College Lake Forest, IL 60045	Conference speaker
Paul Martin, Director State Agency for Title I The University of Tennessee 106 Student Services Bldg. Knoxville, TN 37916 (615) 974-5181	Administering the HEA Title I program. Represent University of Tennessee Continuing Education Division in the area of lifelong learning; gain information to assist in the administering of Title I program.
S.V. Martorana Professor of Higher Education Pennsylvania State University 101 Rackley Building University Park, PA 16802	Higher education; conference panelist.
Pauline Masteron, Assoc. Program Policy Analysis Florida Department of Education Knott Building Tallahassee, FL 32304 (904) 488-6303	Policy analysis

Name	Areas of Responsibility - Reason for Attending
Jane Byers Maynard State Administrator for Title I Alaska Commission on Postsecondary Education Pouch F, State Office Bldg. Juneau, AK 99811 (907) 465-2855	State administrator for Title I - Community Services and Continuing Education. Discussions and information on statewide planning for adult learners, and the Education Amendments of 1976.
Richard Millard, Director Higher Education Services Education Commission of the States 1860 Lincoln Street 300 Lincoln Tower Denver, CO 80203 (303) 393-5200	
Lorna M. Miller, Title I Director State of Wisconsin 432 North Lake Street Madison, WI 53715	
Dave Montgomery Planning and Analysis Florida Board of Regents 107 West Gaines Street Tallahassee, FL 32304 (904) 488-6370	
Earl J. Moore, Assoc. Professor University of Missouri Room 24, Hill Hall Columbia, MO 65201 (314) 882-6660	Counselor education. Become aware of how to relate counseling programs to lifelong learning, and of future state and federal support for lifelong learning systems.
Roger Nichols, Deputy Commissioner Florida Department of Education 121 Capitol Tallahassee, FL 32304 (904) 488-3541	Conference speaker

Name	Area of Responsibility - Reasons for Attending
Ruth S. Nickse, Education Policy Fellow National Institute of Education 1200 9th Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20208 (202) 254-9497	Developing R&D objectives; explore directions state planners perceive as important for NIE.
Henry Nieves, Adm. Asst. to the Commissioner Department of Education P.O. Box 630 Virgin Islands 00801 (809) 774-0100, ext 213	Recommended by Senior Program Officer, Adult Education, Region II Office.
George J. Nolfi, President University Consultants, Inc. 45 Hancock Street Cambridge, MS 02139 (617) 491-5828	Research and consulting with state and federal agencies on state planning and financing of lifelong learning and related services. Exchange ideas with colleagues.
Clifford Norris, State Dir. of Adult Education Oregon State Department of Education 942 Lancaster Drive, N.E. Salem, OR 97310 (503) 378-3971	Community college instruction and directing state ABE program. Want to gain information on Lifelong Learning Act.and issues related to non-traditional postsecondary educational systems.
Harry K. Nyquist, Director Adult/Community Education Brevard Co. Florida Schools 1274 South Florida Avenue Rockledge, FL 32955 (305) 632-5438	Adult/Community Education. A member of the Florida Postsecondary Education Commission -- to explore new trends in postsecondary education.
Michael S. Odom Digital Equipment Corporation 146 Main Street Maynard, MS 01754 (617) 897-5111	
Joseph Olander, Special Asst. to the Commissioner Fla. Department of Education Knott Building Tallahassee, FL 32304 (904) 488-1640	Postsecondary education.

Name	Area of Responsibility - Reasons for Attending
Charles O'Malley Florida Dept. of Education Knott Building Tallahassee, FL 32304 (904) 488-1640	
James Ormiston, Asst. to the Director Community College Unit U.S. Office of Education Washington, D.C. 20202	Conference panelist
James G. Paltridge, Research Educator University of California Center for Research & Development in Higher Education 4603 Tolman Hall Campus Berkley, CA 94720 (415) 642-6732	Principal investigator; get information on recent public policy developments in the US.
Dabney Park, Dir. External Degree Program Florida International Univ. Tamiami Trail Miami, FL 33144	External degree program
Dawn H. Patterson Teaching Assistant Michigan State University 1612 G Spartan Village East Lansing, MI 48823 (517) 355-9750	Programming graduate student activities in lifelong learning. Member of Michigan Adult & Continuing Education Advisory Council. Gather lifelong learning information from other agencies and states.
Milton W. Phillips Director, Public Service and Continuing Education State University and Community College System 1161 Murfreesboro Road Nashville, TN 37217 (615) 741-4821	Want to gain information from other states which will assist staff at Tennessee BOR in our own state planning activities.

Name	Area of Responsibility - Reasons for Attending
William Proctor Associate Dean Pasco-Hernando Community College East Campus State Highway 41, North Dade City, FL 33525 (904) 567-6701	Campus administration; to become familiar with Federal laws dealing with lifelong learning.
Louis Rabineau, Dir. Inservice Education Program Education Commission of the States 1860 Lincoln Street 300 Lincoln Tower Denver, CO 80203 (303) 893-5200	Conference planner
Jayne Rawl Education Policy Fellowship Program Institute for Educational Leadership 1001 Connecticut Avenue, N.W. Suite 310 Washington, D.C. 20036	
Charles B. Reed, Director Educational Planning, Budgeting, and Evaluation Department of Education Knott Building Tallahassee, FL 32304 (904) 488-1916	Conference planner
Allen Rodehaffer State Title I Director University of North Carolina 910 Raleigh Road Chapel Hill, NC 27514 (919) 933-6981	Director of Title I. To determine implications for state planning for Title I - Parts A and B, and Title IV - subpart 5.
Luther R. Rogers Adult Education and Community Services Administrator Department of Education Knott Building Tallahassee, FL 32304 (904) 487-2489	Administration of adult & community education. The conference objectives have a direct relationship to adult and community education.

Name	Areas of Responsibility - Reasons for Attending
Mary T. Rogers Director of Adult and Continuing Education Michigan Dept. of Education P.O. Box 30008 Lansing, MI 48909 (517) 373-3789	All areas of extended learning for adults including academic, occupational, community and continuing education. Lifelong learning is a major focus in the Michigan Dept. of Education.
G. Roger Sell Senior Staff Associate NCHEMS P.O. Drawer P Boulder, CO 80302 (303) 492-8269	To exchange information on programs dealing with lifelong learning.
Barry F. Semple, Dir. Bureau of Adult, Continuing and Community Education 3535 Quakerbridge Road Trenton, NJ 08619 (609) 292-6470	State Director of Adult, Continuing and Community Education. State planning interests.
Peter Smith, President Vermont Community College P.O. Box 81 Montpelier, VT 05601	Conference panelist
Stephanie A. Smith, Title I R.I. Bureau of Postsecondary Education 199 Promenade Street Providence, RI 02908 (401) 277-2685	Administering Title I & IV and functioning as a planner in the Bureau of Postsecondary Education. To find out more about lifelong learning.
Oron South College of Education The Florida State University Tallahassee, FL 32306 (904) 644-6885	
Paul A. Spell, Dir. Alabama Open Learning Program 319 East Annex University of Alabama Tuscaloosa, AL 35486	Direct educational brokering & counseling service as well as an adult education program. Learn about future directions of lifelong learning. Share brokering information.

Name	Areas of Responsibility - Reason for Attending
David W. Stewart, Sr. Staff Associate University of Wisconsin Extended Degree Program 1600 Van Hise Hall Madison, WI 53706 (608) 262-5374	Coordination of brokering services for University of Wisconsin Extended Degree Programs. Want to acquire help in state planning for lifelong learning.
Donald R. Stoddard Assoc. in Higher Education New York State Education Department 99 Washington Avenue Albany, NY 12866 (518) 474-3703	Regents External Degree Program and the College Proficiency Examination Program. To explore issues in non-traditional education.
E. Nelson Swinerton, Dir. University of Wisconsin Extended Degree Program 1512 Van Hise Hall Madison, WI 53705	Development of extended degrees on statewide bases and academic planning, budgeting for 27 campuses in the system. Responsible for lifelong learning in credit programs at state level. Work closely with Nat. Center for Educational Brokering.
Jack Tebo, Assoc. for Policy Analysis Postsecondary Education Department of Education Knott Building Tallahassee, FL 32304 (904) 488-1812	Postsecondary policy analysis. Conference planner.
Carl S. Thomas, Asst. Dir. of Administration and Planning Postsecondary and Adult Education West Virginia Department of Education 1900 Washington St., E. Charleston, WV 25305 (304) 348-6317	Postsecondary and adult education. To receive ideas on how to improve postsecondary education in West Virginia.
Carmen Timiraos, Staff Assoc. NCHEMS P.O. Drawer P Boulder, CO 80302 (303) 492-8269	Project to develop standard terminology for adult/continuing education. Exchange information about efforts to describe educational programs which attempt to foster lifelong learning.

Name	Area of Responsibility - Reasons for Attending
Donn Vickers Assistant Director National Center for Educational Brokering 405 Oak Street Syracuse, NY 13203 (315) 425-5275	
Wilbur Wakefield Minnesota Higher Education Coordinating Board Rochester Regional Postsecondary Education Center Rochester, MN 55901	Postsecondary education. Conference panelist.
Margaret Walker State Coordinator Adult General Education Georgia Department of Education 332 State Office Building Atlanta, GA 30334 (404) 656-2416 or 2417	Coordinator of Adult Basic and Adult Secondary Programs. Interested in the Lifelong Learning Act as well as community and continuing education.
J. Eugene Weldon, Chief Community Service and Continuing Education Branch U.S. Office of Education 400 Maryland Avenue, S.W. Room 3717-ROB3 Washington, D.C. 20202 (202) 245-9868	Community Service and Continuing Education